# THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

VOL. XXXVI, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1929

What Our Past Experience Teaches Us — WARREN GODDARD — 385

Can Man Know Reality? — EVERETT K. BRAY — 400

Emanuel Swedenborg, 1715-1720 — LEWIS F. HITE — 416

Emerson and the Doctrine of Correspondence. IV. — CLARENCE HOTSON, PH.D. — 435

Swedenborg's Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ — FREDERICK M. BILLINGS — 449

"The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel of John" [A Review of a book by Archbishop J. H. Bernard, D. D.] — HECTOR WAYLEN — 456



(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

## EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT


**Editorials :**

The Life at the Fryeburg Summer School LEWIS F. HITE - 468
Word, Doctrine and Discrimination WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - 478

**Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :**

How Did Swedenborg Arrive at the Spiritual Sense? (II)
OTHMAR TOBISCH - - - - - - - - - 481

**Current Literature :**

William F. Wunsch's "The World Within the Bible"
EVERETT K. BRAY - - - - - - - - - 495

William F. Wunsch (Compiler) "Marriage, Ideals and Realization"
H. CLINTON HAY - - - - - - - - - 503

Ernest R. Trattner's "Unravelling the Book of Books"
LEWIS F. HITE - - - - - - - - - - 505

Arthur Stanley Eddington's "The Nature of the Physical World"
FREDERIC R. CROWNFIELD - - - - - - - 511


---

## THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

---


Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION
134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR
(Postage to Canada 8 Cents, and to Europe 16 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)
Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)


---


OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.—*President*, Rev. Paul Sperry, 1824 Park Road, Washington, D. C.; *Vice-President*, Mr. Ezra Hyde Alden, 1223 Commercial Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; *Secretary*, Mr. B. A. Whittemore, 134 Bowdoin Street, Boston 9, Mass.; *Treasurer*, Mr. Albert P. Carter, 511 Barristers Hall, Boston, Mass.

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXVI.] OCTOBER, 1929 [No. 4

## WHAT OUR PAST EXPERIENCE TEACHES US

BY THE REV. WARREN GODDARD.

A LITTLE over one hundred and forty-two years ago the respected and amiable John Clowes, Rector of St. John's Church of Manchester, England, made a special journey to London to persuade some of the members of a little group of readers of Swedenborg not to separate themselves from the "Established Church" of the land.

The views of the Rector on this important matter of separating from either the Church of England or from other established churches were, in the words of Robert Hindmarsh,* listened to with "deference and respect." But these wise and far-seeing first readers were not thus changed in their purpose of forming a separate church organization where, as Hindmarsh says, the new doctrines could be preached "in an open and unreserved manner."

The wisdom of the London group in deciding not to follow the advice of Clowes was amply proven by this fact alone, that in one year after opening their Chapel in Great East Cheap there were seven times as many members and readers added to their numbers as the former London Reading Society added in the four years of its existence.

* Rise and Progress of the New Jerusalem Church, London, 1861.

A few years after its formation, the Great East Cheap Chapel Society recorded with the British Parliament two hundred and fifty-one baptisms of adults and infants.

Previous to this event, and before the establishment of a separate New-Church society at Great East Cheap, the efforts of the Reverend Jacob Duché, a regular minister of the Established Church, to introduce the doctrines of the New Church into the Episcopalian organization, are worthy of notice here. Hindmarsh describes Reverend Duché as follows:

> One of the most eloquent and popular preachers in London, [he] had for some time embraced the doctrines of the New Church, and in all his discourses from the pulpit gave evident proofs of his attachment to them, though at first *with great caution* lest it should be generally known that his sentiments were opposed to the Doctrines of the Established Church.

Hindmarsh goes on:

> Many of our friends attended his ministry on the Sundays, and were highly delighted at the prospect, which they fondly hoped was opening to their view, of the introduction of the new doctrines *gradually* and *insensibly* into the service of the Church of England, by means of such able and pious preachers as Mr. Duché, and some others of the clergy in different parts of the kingdom, who like him were now become receivers of the truth. *But these hopes after many years' experience, proved to be abortive.* [Italics mine.]

These experiences of Duché, the somewhat similar experience of our own Doctor King, the results immediately following the establishment of the Great East Cheap Chapel and other New-Church societies in other parts of the British Isles, all bring at once to the forefront the serious and important subject of the relation of separate New-Church organizations, with their New-Church hymnals, books of worship, rites and sacraments, etc., to the Second Coming of the Lord.

That a direct relation does exist between the organized New Church and what is implied in, and meant by, the Second Coming of the Lord, has been generally conceded

by the majority of thoughtful New-Churchmen from the beginning of the history of the organized body of New-Church people. But the fact that there has arisen from time to time in the history of the Church a question as to the necessity for, and value of, the separate organization, and because in recent times a difference of opinion has arisen as to what is meant by the Second Coming of the Lord and how our organized body is related to this momentous event, it is important for us to do as clear thinking as we can about what the Second Coming was, and means, and about what our organized body's relation to it is.

If we are to think clearly on this question, we shall first have to make the distinction that Swedenborg makes between the Lord's "coming" to the individual man, and His First or His Second Coming to meet vast emergencies and crises in racial religious history. Speaking of God's coming to Abimelech, Swedenborg writes as follows:

> God's coming signifies to *perceive* . . . for perception is nothing else than the *Divine advent* or influx into the intellectual faculty. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2513.)

And elsewhere he remarks:

> The coming of the Lord is . . . His presence in *every one* . . . whenever the gospel is preached, and what is holy is thought of. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3900:9.)

But here we should observe that, in cases of comings of this sort, the enlightenment and perception that is brought to the individual depends upon his spiritual quality as a man or woman, and upon the body of spiritual principles that he has. If vast degenerative movements in the religious history of the race have gone on, so that the individual is deprived of proper and necessary spiritual doctrine and example, a spiritual crisis on a large scale exists, and the Lord then meets the emergency by effecting a special Advent. At the critical time at the "end" of the Most Ancient Church, a body of spiritual principles was providentially given for the spiritual needs of the next or Ancient Church. Later, at the "end" of the Jewish Church,

God Himself came as "the Word made flesh," glorified His Humanity, brought out spiritual truth in new light, cleared the spiritual world of its disorder, and so made way for the First Christian Church. But this last Advent did not prevent the self-assertion, worldliness, and depraved nature of men from again destroying the spiritual character of the Church, and from plunging the race into its last, great spiritual crisis. This last racial religious emergency was forseen by the Lord, and described by Him in the language of the Gospels and the Book of Revelation; and to meet it He promised that He would *come again* "in the clouds of heaven."

But what historically did this Second Advent mean? How was it that the Lord came again during the middle of the eighteenth century, when the above mentioned crisis was at its acute stage? Writing on this point, Swedenborg tells us in the first paragraph of the work on "Heaven and Hell," that the Lord's coming "in the clouds of heaven" means "His presence in the Word *and revelation.*" But precisely just what sort of a "revelation" is meant here? Swedenborg in this same paragraph helps us out by using the word "immediate," and then by telling us explicitly that such an "immediate revelation" involves, first, the opening of "the internal sense of the Word," and, second, the revealing of "the arcana of heaven." And then to make matters still more impressive Swedenborg in this same passage gives us the reason why just this sort of "immediate" revelation was given; namely, that those who have much "worldly wisdom" may not "infect and corrupt the simple in heart and the simple in faith." But notice just what this last statement implies. It means that the Lord deliberately made use of a man to effect His Second Coming who could put the new and sorely needed body of doctrine in such a form that, first, it could be understood by the "simple in heart and simple in faith," and second, that it could be for *them* a defense against the "worldly wis-

dom" of those who might seek to destroy or to nullify its force and implications.

But aside from this miraculously and Divinely provided body of new spiritual doctrine which came by means of the man Swedenborg, and which we know so well, we must not forget another method which the wisdom of the Lord made use of in getting these same doctrines, or at least the fundamentals of them, into the world. This other method is that referred to in the "Spiritual Diary" as a direct revelation from heaven to certain African tribes. (Spiritual Diary, nn. 4774-4780, 5518.) These simple living, but affectionate, Africans, who unlike ourselves are able to "think interiorly," and who live from this interior thought and its enlightenment, are given by direct revelation from heaven what we were obliged to receive in a more roundabout and more external mode. Our stubborn proneness to worldliness and self-assertion with all its pride and self-indulgence and contempt for what is Divine and spiritual, our faith-alone inheritance and faith-alone habits, all these acquired racial characteristics which have destroyed our innocence, made absolutely necessary just the kind of Second Coming that Divine Wisdom provided us with. More intellectual in some respects, more spiritually dull, and vastly less perceptive, than these fortunate contemporaries of Africa, we must get our new doctrine in such a form that, when we do see its meaning, we see that it fulfils, for one thing, the prediction, "Now it is permitted to enter *intellectually* into the mysteries of faith."

As an historical fact for us, then, the Second Coming means the delivery of just this body of new doctrine and spiritual philosophy which we know so well from the volumes of Swedenborg's Writings. But in a spiritual or universal sense the Second Coming means our entrance into the spiritual Holy City, the "New Jerusalem" here and beyond, by our first learning what these doctrines of the Second Coming are, and mean, and require, and then by

our application of their spiritual principles to our feelings, thoughts, and conduct.

These first New-Churchmen in England, in America, in Europe, realized from the very first this dual significance of the Second Coming; and it was for precisely this reason that they began energetically to erect their own churches, work out their own forms of worship and hymnals, and devise their own forms of general conferences and conventions.

These clear-sighted and loyal and devoted New-Churchmen of early days saw almost without hesitation that, if children and older people were to be led into the spiritual life represented by the "New Jerusalem" and the "Second Coming," they must be effectively taught the new spiritual principles given the world by means of the Second Advent, and that by means of a distinct New-Church form of worship and New-Church example they must be helped to use these new principles whenever and wherever they applied. The long and earnest discussions in the very first English Conferences of the New Church regarding the ministry, a catechism for children, forms of New-Church prayers and hymns, the order of the service, the rules for the admission of societies to the General Conference, all these subjects, and more, that were at once brought up, showed how much awake these first New-Churchmen were in regard to the important relation existing between a church and her organization and the spiritual life for which she stands.

Later the subject of New-Church "Day Schools" was vigorously taken up, it being felt that New-Church children at least should pursue their secular studies in a New-Church atmosphere and under properly qualified New-Church teachers. This interest and effort in behalf of such "Day Schools" soon bore good fruit, so that 2106 scholars were enrolled in such educational institutions by the year 1858. And long before this period New-Church magazines and papers had appeared, some lasting only a few

issues, and passing out to make way for more successful ventures of a similar character.

Viewed from almost any point, therefore, it appears that these early New-Church days were characterized by devotion to the new doctrines, energetic teaching of them and writing about them, and by the establishment of far-sighted policies of church organization and church development. And all this devotion and energy resulted in a rapidity of numerical growth that has not been equalled since.

But all this does not mean, of course, that the young and vigorous Church did not have its trials and its differences of opinion. During the first three Conferences for 1789, 1790, 1791, Hindmarsh records:

> Not a dissentient voice was once heard; although the persons, of whom these meetings were composed, were collected from almost every denomination of professing Christians; but all seemed to be animated by one spirit of love, charity, and brotherly affection. (P. 140.)

This condition of affairs, however, began to change as the Fourth General Conference progressed, and strong differences of views emerged regarding the "appointment of ministers" and regarding the question of the three "orders" in the ministry. From this time onwards to the present period in our history it appears that differing views among clergy and laity, or among both, as in other churches, more or less disturbed the harmony of larger or smaller units of the Church's organized life. And, as almost seems inevitable, extremists and individualists, here and there appeared among the ranks of the clergy and the laity, splitting up societies, or more or less disturbing their peace and unanimity. Reverend Cowherd, for example, because of his "extravagant" views and extremist tendencies, broke away from the Peter Street New Church, and established another church to his own liking in King Street, insisting, for example, that only "vegetarians" would be allowed to attend the Lord's Supper. Following Reverend Cowherd, a contemporary, Reverend Dean of Blackburn, in Lanca-

shire, came to the Peter Street Church. Dr. Dean, to quote again from Hindmarsh, was

> A gentleman of considerable ability as a preacher, though but superficially acquainted with the doctrines of the New Church, and entertaining (as he himself expressed in the pulpit) no higher opinion of Swedenborg, than he did of Luther, Calvin, or any other reformer.

And so we might go on through other New Church organizations both in America and in Great Britain and on the Continent. We would find the same story to tell, because of the weakness and frailty and lack of proper training and character development with clergy and laymen alike. The history of the larger bodies of the New Church, as well as of associations, of individual societies, and of individual families, all tell with varying degrees of impressiveness of a more or less steady decline in numbers of interested readers of the doctrines, and of supporters of the organized bodies of the Church. The causes for this are probably more complex than we at first realize; but we may perhaps separate out from the varied factors that enter into the case, two more or less obvious features, namely, worldliness and more or less ineffective leadership.

Much of the early preaching in the Church was simple, direct, and strong in its own way. Excepting for extremists, here and there, and individualists, the main body of the clergy were self-sacrificing and earnest men. But their preaching was often devoted to drawing contrasts between the old and the new faith, and to repeating, with little or no interpretation, the words and phrases of Swedenborg. This sort of pulpit utterance was effective to a certain degree, as well as was the ministerial attempt to teach the internal sense of the Word. And it satisfied the congregations of those days. They grew numerically under this sort of leadership; and without doubt there was spiritual growth as well.

But when science and industry began to develop at great strides, when educational advantages began to become the

possession more and more of the many, when books and periodicals on a vast variety of subjects, and representing almost every conceivable sort of principle and idea, came to the public notice, *then* new influences were brought to bear on New-Church societies and institutions. The appeal of the world and of worldly thought and accomplishment was greatly intensified, and put to ever severer tests one's loyalty to the spiritual principles of the Church, and loyalty to the organized bodies and uses of the Church.

As a result of these changed world influences, some New-Church people became more critical of New-Church preaching and of New-Church institutions, more skeptical about New-Church doctrines, and many of them gradually left the Church, thus leading to a slow numerical decline in membership, and a decline in real interest in, and appreciation of, the Church's spiritual mission. In consequence of this pressure and influence, numbers of the smaller and weaker societies of the Church closed their doors, or are now barely maintaining their existence. Larger societies, by means of endowments, or because of more numerical strength and financial means, still go on, but with diminished interest, and with lessened and more irregular attendance, and in a more critical and restless state of mind.

And further, and more specifically, one of the contributing causes of the present unrest of the Church, and of the present confusion of thought and divergency of views, is the habit of hastily committing oneself to the fashions of thought in science (to "evolution," for example), in philosophy, in psychology, or in the field of the modern critical study of the Bible. This habit must inevitably lead to more or less serious misrepresentation of the real position and teachings of the Church, or to her ultimate division, or destruction, as an organized body. In any case it must weaken in varying degrees her spiritual influence in the world.

We must not at any time become diverted from our plain duty of making a sober and thorough inquiry, first, as to

the facts that underlie these many and ever-changing fashions of thought, and then as to what these facts mean in the light of the spiritual philosophy of the Church. From the basis of well attested facts, and in the light of the Church's universal spiritual principles of life, we must build up our criticisms of modern day thought and ideas, and select from them what really seems to be permanent and contributory to the best natural and spiritual life that we can conceive of, for our modern or for future times. Hasty utterances in the name of the Church regarding the meaning and significance of world movements, world opinions, and world theories, and the uncritical adoption of worldly ideas and theories, greatly handicap us in our efforts to lift men and women up to the level of spiritual life symbolized by the "New Jerusalem," and to establish in them a steady appreciation of, and dependence upon, the Word and the doctrines of the Church. If our ministers do not carry out the plain implications in the admonition of our ordination service, to "preach this Word according to these doctrines," who *will* do it? And what can we expect in the future?

Plainly, then, one of the most striking lessons that our past and present experience teaches us, is, that what is immediately needed in the life of the Church is not less doctrine, but better understood doctrine, and more intelligently and more persistently applied doctrine. Whatever the world may say about creeds and doctrine, the solid fact remains—and will stand as long as human life continues, that is, forever—that man's spiritual life is dependent upon, and qualified by, the kind of spiritual doctrine that he learns and seeks and lives, and the motives from which he seeks and uses this doctrine. According to the kind and quality of doctrine, and to the use that is made of it, are churches distinguished by the Lord and by the angels of heaven.

Doctrine is the Divinely given means by which men and women are lifted up to heavenly states here and beyond, and by which they are saved from the unhappy consequences

of selfish and worldly life here and beyond death, and so set free to live useful, happy, and ever-expanding spiritual lives. That is why the Lord said, in parting from His disciples, "Tarry ye in the *city of Jerusalem until* ye be endued with *power* from on high." He did not say, "Tarry ye under this *fig-tree* until ye be endued with power from on high," which would have meant an entirely different sort of thing spiritually interpreted. He told them to get into the city of Jerusalem, and to *stay there* until the power from on high came to them; then they could go forth effectively to their new and hazardous duties as apostles and missionaries. The "city of Jerusalem" in which they were to stay, means for our ministers, in their personal experience as apostles of the Second Coming, the learning, loving, understanding of this new body of spiritual doctrine that is in the Church, and the living from it until the Lord and heaven act into it, and give them the *power* and the light of it. When that happens then are they ready, in some little degree, to go and try and tell other men about the new light, and the new life to which it leads. The doctrine in which our ministers are to "tarry" is the doctrine about the nature of unselfish life; and the *power* of that doctrine is the power which unselfish love exerts *in* and *through* this doctrine.

But once given this doctrine that the Second Coming has brought, how shall we use it? In the light of our past and present experience as a Church, how are we to make the most effective use of this new spiritual truth that has come to us? Do we not find the answers we need in the Word itself? Whether we are parents, Sunday-school teachers, lay preachers, or ministers, is not the first and most central rule of all about the effective use of doctrine given in those striking words to the first disciples, "Follow *Me* and *I* will make you *fishers of men*"? To follow the Lord as New-Churchmen means to learn and to do what the Lord teaches us in the spiritual meaning of the Word, as this meaning is

given us by means of the spiritual principles in our doctrines.

But if this first and fundamental requirement about the spiritual use of doctrine has been in some degree complied with, how shall we proceed? Here again do we not find our answer in that memorable post-resurrectional scene on the Sea of Galilee, when the Lord said to the unsuccessful fishermen, "Cast the *net* on the right side of the *ship,* and ye shall find"; and also in the simple commentary on the words, "that *night* they caught nothing"?

If we sincerely follow the Lord as New-Churchmen, our next step in becoming "fishers of men" is, first, to know what these men-fish are that we seek to catch, and then to select our ship and the appropriate net, and finally, to fish in the *daytime,* and on the *right side* of the ship.

Our doctrines declare that these men-fish we seek to catch, or lift up to higher states of life, are those "that are in *general truths* and in faith conjoined with charity." But if these men-fish are in these general truths—for example, that there is a God, that men sin, that there is a future life, and so on—and have conjoined them with charity, some may ask, Why disturb them? What more can the New Church do for them? The answer is, of course, that there are higher and higher levels of spritual experience above the man-fish level, and that the doctrines of the New Church can bring men-fish up to those levels, when these doctrines are learned and lived from spiritual motives. But when we attempt to lift men up into these higher states, or when we attempt to "catch men," we are expressly forbidden to do our fishing in the *night time;* that is, we are not to go to our business of fishing from motives of selfish or worldly love and ambition. Such night-time fishing increases our own sinfulness, leads only to dreary and unproductive results, and leaves men where they were, and unmoved by our appeals. In the daytime of the spirit, which comes to us when we are sincerely moved by the spiritual love of saving men and lifting them up, we must take our ships and nets

and sail away to the fishing-grounds. The "ships" into which we must get and by which we are to reach and understand the states of those we would help, and the "ships" from which we must do our work and into which we are to lift men, are just these new spiritual doctrines of the Church and the new life which they describe and make possible.

And the "nets" that we must use,—are these not, first of all, necessarily various in size, weave, and shape? For are there not, indeed, many varying sorts and kinds of these men-fish that need to be "caught" for more heavenly experiences in this world and in the next? But in general, are not the "nets" that we must use, those particular and special presentations of our doctrines that we must make in order to reach the needs and states of special classes of those who are men-fish, but who desire to be lifted up into sunnier and more spiritual conditions of life? Are not these "nets" represented by the "tracts" and special sermons that we try to get out, or should be getting out? Should not these nets be just those adaptations and interpretations of our doctrines that will the most effectively arouse in men a desire to apply spiritual teaching to the concrete problems of their uses, and so find themselves lifted up to new and wider spiritual experiences?

Suppose that the class we most desire to reach and to lift up into these new spiritual things meant and described by the "Holy City," are modern politicians. What might our net look like? First, because the Scriptures speak only of catching men-fish, and these spiritual fish have been given the characterization that Swedenborg gives us, namely, "those in general truths and in a life of faith conjoined with charity," we might begin to weave our net by saying, perhaps, "You believe in God. You believe that men should keep the Commandments. You believe in the Golden Rule. You believe that men have souls, and that they can destroy them by sin. But before seeing how these very general truths of religion are connected with the grave responsibilities of a politician's life, let us read together from these

doctrines and from this Word of God, and see if we all cannot get a higher and more spiritual view of these general religious truths that you have known so long, and which you have tried to apply in your work. Here is a new doctrine of the Lord, the Word, the spiritual world, the Commandments, the meaning of the neighbor, and so on. Let us all study these things together, and then let us talk over with you in a friendly way some of the immensely difficult concrete problems that you must face and try to solve. You know best, of course, from concrete experience just what those problems are in detail and how intricate they are; but should not stock-watering, the tariff, the abuse of corporate power, the abuse of labor-union power, the suppression of free speech and a free press,—should not all these things, for example, and much more, be looked at in the light of these new and higher principles of neighborly love and of love to the Lord? And when so viewed do they not suggest remedial legislation of one kind or another, for which we can all work as individuals? We cannot solve your concrete cases for you, but we are immensely concerned about what *you* do about them, for millions of human beings need your help and your best political wisdom, a wisdom founded upon these new spiritual principles of a new revelation to men. You have religious interests and religious feelings; but in the light of these new teachings can you not do more for these great masses of people who labor under great economic and other burdens that we all should be trying to lighten in the name of Him who came to give life, and more abundant life, to all?"

If we made some such approach as this, should we not be making a New-Church "net," and using it on the *right side* of the ship? And if our motive were really to help these much tempted struggling politicians, with their many and most difficult problems, to view their tasks in the light of these new higher doctrines of the Second Coming, should we not be doing our part in helping to lift them up?

But however this may be, I feel certain that the most

impressive lessons that our past and present experience as a Church teaches are: first, that we must be loyal to our doctrines; that we must make a more intelligent use of these doctrines in interpreting the thought and the life of the modern world; and finally, that we must become better leaders and teachers in the Church, better "fishers of men," through our study and interpretation of these doctrines, and through our persistent resistence to the pervasive spirit of worldliness and self-assertion in our modern world.

WARREN GODDARD.

# CAN MAN KNOW REALITY?

By the Rev. Everett K. Bray

WHO reads the magazines of to-day cannot but wonder if ever there was a time when men were so generally interested in the subject of religion, and even perhaps in religion itself, as now. Never, surely, did so many men and women bare their minds to so many hearers as to-day. And so never were so many able to view the questions of religion from so many points of view, from so many states of mind.

All the way from the vigorous faith-heartening broadside of William Sullivan, through the "new technique of worship" of Herbert Parrish, the "Middle Way" of Elizabeth Case, the shadow-faith of Robert Keable, to the animal-man and "non-existent God" of Joseph Krutch,* we are permitted to see the minds of fellow voyagers on the ever moving sea of life. And, if we happen to have a little knowledge of the interrelationships of the complex thing lives are, we read there, too, the story of the company they keep, and most prize the approval of, the unfolding of, the behavior of their faculty called Reason, and the autobiography of their will. A rare privilege indeed for those interested in the souls of men!

One thing standing out most clear in all this is, that the present lands of travel are fraught with fog-banks, with clouds, with icebergs on occasions, and with many alarming storms. With increasing numbers the voyage of faith is not smooth.

Although all this centers about the Bible, the weather-factory quite evidently centers in the location of the question: Can Reality be known? On this ultimate question hangs the immediate question of the standing of the Bible and its message. The findings, to date, of Biblical scholar-

* Recent writers in the *Atlantic Monthly*.

ship are not, as often is inferred, the sole obstacles to an affirmative answer to this question; instead they are only one of the tools used by those who will to use them so. For so long as man is free to be himself, there will always be excuses of "fact" and "reason" for minds whose wills will not yet to believe. It is only after wills have been touched from Above that they become ready to see "facts" from their farther side.

This is the ground so well taken by Elizabeth Case. It is the position of Professor William James in his monumental work, "Varieties of Religious Experience." He says:

> Philosophy lives in words, but truth and fact well up into our lives in ways that exceed verbal formulation. There is in the living act of perception always something that glimmers and twinkles and will not be caught, and for which reflection comes all too late.

He also lays his pen on one of the outstanding explanations of why so many are unable intellectually to find reality, as he observes that, "so long as we deal only with the cosmic and the general, we deal only with the symbols of reality." Of course. Universals and generals are so expansive and so impersonal and so necessarily beyond our finite compassing, that they must for ever elude our puny grasp. "But," as James says, "as soon as we deal with private and personal phenomena as such, we deal with realities in the completest sense of the term." And such is the greater weight of personal experiences that he says:

> I think we must concede that the attempt to demonstrate by purely intellectual processes the truth of the deliverances of direct religious experience is absolutely hopelèss.

On the other hand, the giant intellect of Professor Josiah Royce did not concede that God was beyond intellectual demonstration. *But he saw Him as within,* the very life and soul of the Universe, yet not of it a distinguishable part. He says:

> He isn't any where in space or in time; He makes from with-

out no worlds. He is no hypothesis of empirical science. But He is all the more real for that, and His existence is all the surer.

[It is] the deepest tragedy of our finitude, that continually He comes to His own, and His own receive Him not, that He becomes flesh in every least incident of our lives; whilst we, gazing with wonder upon His world, search here and there for first causes [as James says, seek to the "cosmic and general"], look for miracles, and beg him to show us the Father, since that alone will suffice us. No wonder that we have to remain agnostics. "Hast thou been so long time with me, and yet hast thou not known me?" Such is the eternal answer of the Logos to every doubting question. Seek Him not as an outer hypothesis to explain experience. Seek Him not anywhere yonder in the clouds. He is no "thing in itself." But for all that experience contains Him. He is the reality, the soul of it. "Did not our heart burn within us while he talked with us by the way?" . . . He does not talk merely to our hearts. He reveals Himself to our coolest scrutiny. (The Spirit of Modern Philosophy.)

In pressing the thesis that reason compels him to belief in the Divine Being, he says:

My reason for believing that there is one absolute World-Self, who embraces and is reality, whose consciousness includes and infinitely transcends our own, in whose unity all the laws of nature and all the mysteries of experience must have their solution and their very being—is simply that the profoundest agnosticism which you can possibly state in any coherent fashion, the deepest doubt which you can any way formulate about the world or the things that are therein, already presupposes, implies, demands, asserts, the existence of a World-Self. . . . There is no escape from the infinite Self except by self-contradiction. If you deny him, you already in denying affirm him. You reckon ill when you leave him out. (He) is actually asserted by you in every proposition you utter, is at the heart, so to speak, of the very multiplication table.

Thus firm is Royce in the conviction through reason, of the immanence of the Divine in His Universe and all its least particulars. In this he is in striking agreement with the position come to by Swedenborg through revelations.

Canon Streeter, of Oxford, in his book, "Reality, A New Correlation of Science and Religion" (1926), sees *in the*

*nature of the Universe* our necessity for asking questions. But asking questions of the Universe has its dangers. He himself got badly lost in doing so. From the position of thinking that he held the solution in his intellect, further reaches of intellect, plus the "findings" of modern Biblical scholarship, so shook his foundations that, he tells us, he was at the point of relinquishing his Orders, and leaving the ministry of the Church behind him. But at this point he began to attend the Summer Conferences of the Student Christian Movement. And there, he says:

> I gained a renewed confidence that in Religion man can attain to a genuine apprehension of Reality, of that "Beyond which is also Within," in a way, and of a kind, which any intellectual theory of the Universe must account for or confess itself bankrupt.

The result of this discovery was to show him that men are asking the wrong question when they ask, "Is Christianity true?", the very formulation of which "implies that Religion itself is the problem," whereas the test of Religion is its offer of a solution of "the problems which are posed by life—of which the problem of evil is the chief." And his advice to those who would find help unto the experience of the Reality of the Divine is, that

> [We shall] do this best if, without forgetting the God revealed in Nature in its sublimity and beauty, we chiefly think of Him in terms of Christ; (to find thus) "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

Thus have some of the most profound thinkers of modern times come to the conclusion and confession that when life is surveyed honestly in its wholeness and in terms of personal experience, theories must be put to the four winds if they do not *take religious experience into factual account* as part of the world of reality. Professor James goes so far as to say:

> This absolute determinability of our mind by abstractions (as examples, "essential goodness, beauty, strength, significance, justice") is one of the cardinal facts of our human constitution.

Polarizing us and magnetizing us as they do, we turn towards them and from them, seek them, hold them, hate them, just as if they were so many concrete beings. And beings they are, beings as real in the realm which they inhabit as the changing things of sense are in the realm of space.

With all things dispassionately considered, it is his philosophical conclusion that

The existence of mystical states absolutely overthrows the pretension of non-mystical states to be the sole and ultimate dictators of what we may believe. . . . They do not contradict . . . facts as such, or deny anything that our senses have immediately seized. It is the rationalistic critic rather who plays the part of denier in the controversy, and his denials have no strength, for there never can be a state of facts to which new meaning may not truthfully be added, provided the mind ascend to a more enveloping point of view. It must always remain an open question whether mystical states may not possibly be such higher points of view, windows through which the mind looks out upon a more extensive and inclusive world.

Such testimony is in full harmony with the assertions of the Sacred Scriptures, that to know Reality is entirely possible, that the experience of spiritual life is not one whit less to be trusted than is any experience of the natural life through the external senses. But in view of the fact that so many deny this, we still have the question, But how is a man who does not know it, or believe it, to come into knowledge of it? The answer is that there is only one way; namely, by an act of will; by willing to surrender the will that has kept him out of it; by putting his naturalistic prejudices all aside for the time, and by trying out an unqualified acceptance of the Invitation of the spiritual realm of being, to come over into it and there experience it *on its own ground*. No man can come "unless the Father . . . draw him"—unless the drawing of the Divine Love hovering over the inner deeps of his soul be permitted to have Its way with him, be permitted to persuade him to try the new life-way which He offers. To be affected by this call of Love, man must first make his self-hood "still". Then only can he first *know* that there *God is;* then only

come to experience that "The LORD of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge." The necessity is inherent in the discontinuity of the two levels of experience involved in life: "If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." Do first; then know.

I cannot *know* that the Hawaiian Islands exist, never yet having personally experienced them. But the testimony of multitudes of other persons whose integrity I have no reason to doubt, that they have experienced them, makes me *believe* they exist—to sufficient degree that I would have no hesitancy whatever about accepting an invitation to set out for them, in full assurance that their reality would become a matter of experience to me. On the same grounds —the testimony of others—every man may start his journey toward the spiritual of life. It is an invitation to take a journey unto a realm of promised wondrous beauties, delights, joys, accomplishments, of *a life within.* As an offer it comes, saying: Try it. Not as a "system" to be accepted first, but as an offer to be taken at its face value. Take it. If it becomes Reality with you, the rest that is needed will follow. You will not have lost any thing worth retaining. The outer world will still be yours, but you will have gained besides the inner world. And life, larger, fuller, richer, more whole and more wholly satisfying than any thing you yet have known, will be your reality. Try it. Can you hear the whisper calling in the far off deep of you, saying, "It is real. It *is* real. It IS REAL." Can you stop that tempest sea of doubts, long enough *just to listen?* Then, "In the still small voice" the LORD will come to you, and by His holy Love draw you to Himself. And you will know Reality.

This conclusion, attested by some of our most rational thinkers, and by race-wide experience, that Reality may be known, has significant bearing upon what may rationally be done with the Bible. For touch with Reality is the key-claim of the Bible to a hearing. On that claim it stands or falls; on that it gains all or loses all. Accordingly, sum-

mary disposal of it cannot be lightly made by those who would be rational in their purpose not to lose true Values.

In face of its insistent claim that it speaks from Reality, thus from the Mind which is as much higher in thoughts than the height of man's mind "as the heavens are higher than the earth," as infinite Love and Wisdom and Purpose are above finite love and understanding and pursuits,—in face of this it is hardly a safe thing to irrevocably decide that "We know the writings of the Bible meant what they said, and nothing more." What more they meant than what they said (upon the surface) may not yet be seen by a student, and he may well confess it; but for him to insist that because he has not yet seen it, it cannot be there, may be to place himself in the position of many a man who has sold a mine in the name of a mere farm.

It is entirely within the possible that, just as there is more for man in Nature than primitive man saw in it, and more seen to-day than the men of yesterday saw in it, with its blessings ever more wonderfully unfolding for man as he advances to use of them, that there is likewise more for man in the Bible than those through whom, and to whom, it first was given could comprehend, or even dream was there, and that its blessings, its Divinely given meanings, may endlessly unfold as men grow into understanding of them in readiness to apply them in the kingdom of the spiritual life.

The difficulties in the way of accepting this view of the Scriptures, that now loom so large in the eyes of many, are not nearly so great as generally they are thought to be. They center largely around the comparative lateness of the manuscripts on which our versions rest, and the variations from them in some other manuscripts extant, the oldest Old Testament manuscript being said to date from the ninth century A.D., and the oldest of the New Testament from the fourth century A.D. The chief objection to dependable inspiration on this ground is the pure assumption that "many errors would naturally creep in" in the copying of

the manuscripts, and that therefore we cannot be sure of what the Scripture in its original writing was. This assumption arises from a state of mind that, if it grants the possibility of knowing Reality, does not see that the Divine One Who could give a Revelation must be equally able to keep it whole and safe—even all the while that He was letting man feel that *he* did it. The care of the Jews over their Scriptures and their exacting guards against error in transcribing them is proverbial. Their unquestioned belief in their extreme holiness, and their genius for exactness in external observances, insured their placing every guard around their preservation. And in regard to the New Testament, it is interesting to observe how some of the most eminent of Biblical scholars who began with the theory that the manuscripts were of very late date, and that there was no certainty as to their authorship, have been converted by further weighing of the available facts, to hold now that they "are veracious and worthy of belief." Notable among these are Sir William Ramsay and Professor Harnack. Harnack has come back to hold that Luke's Gospel was written before he wrote the book of Acts, which was done about 63 A.D. And all are agreed that Mark was written earlier. Peter's death is placed at somewhere between 65 and 67 A.D. All agree that John lived much longer. This places these works within the life time of actual disciples of the Lord. All this is given scholarly and illuminating treatment by Dr. Charles Gore, formerly Bishop of Oxford, in his "Reconstruction of Belief."

Therefore if we have sufficient faith to believe in the power of the Lord to do what He is recorded in John to have promised, to "bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," then nothing stands in the way of our accepting the Gospels as a record directed by the Risen, Glorified, Lord Himself, giving us His life and words upon earth,—thus a genuine Divine Revelation. The Book of Revelation certainly abounds in testimony to its Divine origin.

Our Lord repeatedly quoted the Old Testament, and, for those who know the Hebrew Bible, it is clear that He specified that twenty-eight books of those Scriptures bore hidden testimony of Himself. These He "expounded" to them, and "opened their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures." Besides those books included under the titles, "The Law" and "The Prophets," He specified Daniel and the Psalms, which were in a group under another heading, as testifying concerning Him. David had been aware that more was in the Psalms which he wrote than had been put into them by himself; for he says: "The spirit of the LORD spake by me, and His word was in my tongue." The prophets often knew that they were in touch with Reality, and that they were writing from the LORD, and so they declared. It was the same with the writer of the books of Moses, called in the Hebrew Bible, "The Law."

The Christian Church began in belief in the Divine authorship and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. Following the example of the Lord, in interpreting them in terms of Himself and His Kingdom, Paul treats the experiences of Israel therein recorded, as "examples, to the intent that we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted," even seeing their *Divine record* as *superior to the events*, saying: "Now, all these things happened unto them for examples: and they are written for our admonition." So also the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews goes into extended particulars in showing how specific rites and events in the Scripture signified corresponding things in the Lord and His offices of ministry. So, too, the early Church fathers, notable among them Clement, Origen, Saint Augustine, endeavored to *develop a continuous* allegorical sense in the Old Testament; and almost every preacher down to the present time, has seen somewhere representative significances in texts under study.

Calvin, however, came to all this with flat challenge and vehement denial. He would have but one meaning, and

that the literal meaning, for every Scripture. Luther in theory agreed to the same principle, but in practice sometimes made use of allegory and representative as effectively as many of the fathers. With Calvin stands to-day, like the undivided waters of the Red Sea saying to Israel, "You shall not pass," the so-called modernist school of Biblical scholarship. The Bible, they insist, means exactly what it meant to those who first gave it utterance, speaking only to the situation then in hand. No meaning beyond their meaning, practical to their hour, can be allowed. This, of course, for those who can come to it, putting all the history and practice of the Church, and the example of the Lord, behind them, greatly simplifies the Bible problem. It gives but two horns to the dilemma: Either the LORD wrote some exceedingly trivial and unworthy things; or He did not write the Bible at all, but men wrote it. The choice becomes quickly made, and all is settled, that men wrote it.

Now no one to-day will deny that there were grave difficulties in the allegorical method, as practiced by the Church fathers—chiefly arising from absence of any key-principles by which uniformity and spirituality in results could be had. Each interpreter was a law unto himself, often devising meanings which came to highly arbitrary and conflicting results. The outcome was to seem to make the Bible mean whatever each interpreter saw fit to make it to mean. And this was discrediting to the entire system. So, because of its arbitrary nature, the modernist school of to-day arbitrarily rejects it. Yet, total rejection after it is flatly made, does not always satisfy. Dr. Fosdick, after ardently championing the modernist rejection, admits that when he comes to some of the works of our Lord, as for example the miraculous draft of fishes, he does not know how to understand their meaning, and confesses: "Our Occidental minds probably miss many symbolic literary devices in an Oriental book, and this may be one of them."

Grave indeed is the outcome of taking to one-self the full modernist view, reducing the Bible to the level of a

human book, seeing it no longer as the Divine Book. That is more shattering to faith in a Personal God, than any step that intellect ever has taken in His name; because there is something native in the breast of every man which tells him, articulately or inarticulately, that if a Personal God there be, He will be inevitably in the effort to reveal Himself and His Will and His Wisdom to the children whom He has created. And, in the breast of man, until it gets tangled up with some one-sided operations of the mind of him, it does not seem an insuperable thing, or an unreasonable thing, that the One Who made him should raise up certain individuals through whom He could deliver His message, even exactly as He wanted it delivered,—neither more impossible that He should preserve its integrity through the ages after its deliverance.

Accordingly, when certain "findings" of the mind tell a man to-day that simply he cannot take the Bible as that Revelation, if he would pass present tests of a well-instructed and intelligent being; when this is told him, and his mind accepts it, he finds himself—if he be a person of spiritual experience already—launched upon a voyage of grave internal conflicts. His soul says, "The LORD *could have given* us a Book, a veritable Word from Himself, such as we had thought the Bible was. Our souls know we need it; we are in constant hunger for a Word from Him. Why, oh why, has He not given it, as the Bible claims He has? How could He have suffered us to be mocked by such precious hopes, left groundless and false?" Doubts, grave doubts, there toss the ship of faith upon a boisterous sea.

Such is the confession of Elizabeth Case, in the February *Atlantic,* who having come to the knowledge of the Lord through conversion and will-surrender, yet is driven, mentally, by the modernist position regarding the Scripture. She finds Reality by the act of will in surrendering itself to Reality. Of those who do this, she says, "These *let* themselves experience Jesus as the Son of God—and that

experience creates a presupposition which tips the balance." Yet, being intellectually at sea respecting the reliability of the Scriptures as the Divine Word, she has this to confess:

> There remains the worst enemy of faith, the doubt in the believer's own heart. Sometimes he feels that the solution of the middle way, the postulation of faith in the imperative mood, belittles the reason by its undeniable *reductio ad hominem*. Even after conversion, the intellectual difficulties of faith are forever a thorn in the side. The Church is a hard mistress. Often he wonders how he could possibly have arrived at this middle way!

Such must ever be the stormy way of faith for one who comes to the Lord in self-surrender, and then finds the Bible ruled out of standing as the Lord's Word. It is like having found Him through a certain Mirror, and then being informed that the Mirror had never really existed, that it had been only an illusion of our own mind!

It is thus apparent that promiscuous allegorizing and rigid literalism, both spoil the Bible for what, by its own claim, it was meant to do. The one insults the intelligence of the reader; the other starves his spirit. Neither one can supply a faith that meets the needs of the whole man.

And yet those who go to the Bible for life are sure that the Lord does speak to them in it, that, while they read it thus, He draws particularly near to them. The problem of the Bible is not solved yet. What is to be done about it?

There is an answer not yet examined.

What men will do with that answer depends upon their willingness to give it unbiased, thorough, and scholarly examination. Giving it a glance, and then turning it off with a gesture, will not affect the validity of that answer, neither will it carry the Bible challenge any nearer to solution.

Let us approach this answer by a picture. In the Revelation given through John, One is seen riding upon a white horse, leading the armies of heaven in the battles of righteousness. He is clothed in a vesture dipped in blood, and He has "a name written which no man knew, but He Himself." "And His name is called, The Word of God."

Again, when a Book is held, sealed with seven seals, no one is found worthy to open it but the Lord Himself, in the likeness of the Lamb.

How could it be otherwise? Who could know the infinite deeps of meaning which the Infinite Lord puts into His Word, but He Himself? Who else shall adequately interpret them? When in the Flesh, He always spoke in parables; and then the disciples called on Him to interpret them. In Him is demonstrated that it is the very nature of the Divine to speak in parables—for He has more in thought than the surface of any words can body forth. Infinity is not compassed by finiteness so readily that the first meaning men would take from His utterance would exhaust the deeps on deep of His Love and Wisdom pouring into it.

Accordingly, a further contact with Reality, a further revelation, is needed to help men to the right approach to His Parable Revelation, The Word. The same is promised in the Revelation and in the Gospel. He would yet send the spirit of The Truth and teach men plainly. He would take the sealed Book and open it. And why not? Should this be a thought too shocking for consideration? If the Race-man grows in ability to understand, is it not in order for the means of further understanding to be given?

But a revelation to "open" the Word would be of a different character from the Revelation that the Word Itself is. For the Word, being the Lord's Own verbal utterances, is necessarily of Parable Nature, embodying as in a garment or ultimate periphery the infinite deeps of His Own Mind and Being. Only so could He put within a Volume that might be read by men *within a life-time* any adequate revealment of Himself. Only so can He speak, when His thoughts come down to human levels, anyway. So the revelation which will open the Word will be a revelation to men's understanding. It will be a showing, in intellectual light, of the principle by which these words of The Word are made to contain Him and His Wisdom for man. It

will be a showing to man's rational comprehension, the keys according to which natural language was made to take on the parable of Infinite Language. It will accordingly be made, not by giving some further prophet specified *words* to utter—which itself would necessarily be an addition to the Word—*but by uniquely lifting up some man's understanding* into the higher and universal light of genuine spiritual realities, so that he would see from above rather than from below in his reading of the Scriptures. (A possibility which James's conclusions certainly admit.) In this way, his report of what he saw in this higher light would be a revelation of interpretation, a passing on to others not so specially lifted, the comprehending truths of the larger, loftier, spiritual vision.

The declaration of this revelation has been given. And although it stands distinctly as a revelation, it neverthless rests on a basis of exact relationships between things of nature and natural life and things of the spirit and spiritual life. It is open to the tests of intellectual appraisal, and courts a hearing on the ground of consistency with reason and with every truth of natural science. Know nature, know the soul, know the Bible, and see if they do not fit together in a new unity under this light. This is the simple invitation it offers.

It has been in the world since the middle of the eighteenth century. It began in the publication in 1749 of the "Arcana Cœlestia"—a work interpreting verse by verse the books of Genesis and Exodus; it went on through the publication of the "Apocalypse Revealed"—a work doing the same thing with the Book of Revelation—interspersing many related volumes, and interpreting other large areas of the Word, and establishing the "science of correspondences," which is the key of universal application; and was concluded in the publication of the "True Christian Religion" in 1772. But for all that these works have been so long in the world, it is one of the amazing things of Christian history that so little of the truths they teach is

known, even by Bible scholars, that no scholar mentions them even when he presumes to scan the entire field of Bible treatment, and apparently not one in ten thousand among the Bible readers outside of the few thousands in the Church built upon application of them, knows that such writings exist.

The writer of them was unknown for years, excepting to his publishers. It later became known that his name was Emanuel Swedenborg. In 1768 he wrote a letter to one of the prominent leaders of the Church in Sweden, which looks like a discerning prophecy of the pass to which things have come in our day, in many quarters, with respect to treatment of the Bible. In it he admonished the rulers of the Church

> To receive thoroughly this belief, that the Word in its bosom is spiritual because Divine; and that unless they receive this belief they may be seduced by satans, so that they even deny the sanctity of the Word; in which case the church with them will be dissipated . . . if they do not believe the internal sense of the Word, the Word may finally appear to them as some unpolished and unconnected writing, or even a book of all heresies, because from the literal sense (alone), as from a kind of lake, heresies of every sort may be drawn forth and confirmed.

In another letter to the same clergyman (Rev. F. C. Oetinger), he said:

> I can solemnly bear witness that the Lord Himself has appeared to me, and that He has sent me to do that which I am doing now, and that for the purpose He has opened the interiors of my mind, which are those of my spirit, so that I may see those things which are in the spiritual world, and hear those who are there, and which privilege I have had now for twenty-two years.
>
> The mere bearing witness, however, does not suffice at the present day to convince men of this; but any one of sound understanding may be confirmed by the testimony of my writings, and especially by the "Apocalypse Revealed."
>
> These writings of mine concerning the New Jerusalem cannot be called prophecies, but revelations.

No matter what men's first reaction to this claim may be, it stands, at the least, as a challenge to a careful and schol-

arly examination by all who would exhaust every possible key to the solution of the Bible problem. And especially for every one who admits the possibility of man's coming to touch with Reality, does this opportunity of systematic examination of a system that promises so much, that offers an as yet untouched solution of the Biblical dilemma of to-day, call for more than a gesture before it shall be passed up as non-significant.

Perhaps at superficial glance it has been confused with allegory. But let there be no mistake. It is not allegory. It is not literalism. It is a new thing in the world. *It is the opening of the spiritual sense of the Holy Word of the Lord.* Many who have come to it have realized as never before the truth announced by Professor James when he insisted that "there never can be a state of facts to which new meaning may not truthfully be added, provided the mind ascend to a more enveloping point of view," finding "windows through which the mind looks out upon a more extensive and inclusive world." Many have found their "heart burn within them" as they have heard their Lord anew, speaking to them from those sacred pages which they may "have loved long since and lost a while," now seen in opened understanding, to be verily His Holy WORD.

EVERETT K. BRAY.

# EMANUEL SWEDENBORG, 1715-1720.

By the Rev. Lewis F. Hite.

AFTER an absence of almost five years spent as a student in England, France, Holland, and Germany, Swedenborg returned in his twenty-eighth year to Brunsbo, where he was to make his headquarters for the next five years, journeying on occasion to other places at the call of business and professional occupations. At first he was immersed in his machines and inventions. He was planning a private observatory at Kinnekulle, where he would make observations for himself, as a basis for his work on the determination of longitude. He was also at this time on the lookout for employment.

We recall that as early as the summer of 1710, through the good offices of his father and of his brother-in-law, Eric Benzelius, Swedenborg spent a few weeks with Polhem at Stiernsund, where the latter had established a mechanical institute at the King's expense. Swedenborg was supposed to observe and learn what he could, but Polhem found him so ready and capable that he called on him freely and largely for assistance. By this means the three men—the King, Polhem, and Swedenborg—were brought into close association. Five years later, in the latter part of 1715, we find Swedenborg and Polhem in correspondence about the *Dædalus Hyperboreus*, a scientific magazine planned and edited by Swedenborg, and the first in Sweden. Writing from Stiernsund, December 7, 1715, Polhem says:

> With peculiar joy and delight I have heard of your praiseworthy intention to publish, under your own care and at your own expense, the interesting and useful information in physical mathematics and mechanics which has been collected by the *Collegium Curiosorum* at Upsala and by yourself. . . . Whatever I am able to contribute

for the further promotion of the enterprise, I will forward to you with the greatest pleasure; since I take a deep interest in everything that promises to be useful and creditable to our country.

Writing a little later, December 19, of some questions in mechanics, he continues:

In the mechanical laboratory, experiments are made at the expense of the King on the most important parts of a number of things, which agree pretty well with theory and mathematical calculation,—viz., of the resistance of mediums and the friction of substances, which have also their proportions; but the subject is too extensive to be treated in a letter. But if you wish to apply yourself diligently to the study of mechanics, I should very much like, if you are willing, that you would put up with my small accommodation, and more frequently confer orally with me; from which, I have no doubt, both of us would derive satisfaction. . . . As soon as you have committed to the press what you have in hand, and wish to undertake something new, it may be useful to have some talk about it. If, therefore, it be not too much trouble for you to travel so long a distance, it would be a great honor and delight to me, if you would visit me at Stiernsund; for I cannot sufficiently express the esteem I entertain for all those who are interested in the little knowledge I possess.

These letters mark the renewal of that friendly intercourse which began five years before, and which now centered in their combined efforts to furnish material for the *Dædalus*. The proposed visit was made probably some time in January, for on the following February 14, Swedenborg writes to Benzelius: "Next time I hope to insert something more useful from the materials collected in Stiernsund, during my short stay there." After this visit, we hear nothing more of their being together until the following December. In the meantime Swedenborg was staying at Brunsbo, working up material for the *Dædalus*, and making occasional scientific and business excursions. But the life did not satisfy him. He wanted to get into some regular employment suited to his tastes and abilities. Writing in April, he says: "I shall not be able to come over to Upsala for some time; for I intend to remain here until there is some opening for me; as I am nearer here to ad-

vocate it in the proper quarter." The reference here seems to be to the King.

The first number of the *Dœdalus* appeared sometime in February, 1716, and contained several articles on ear-trumpets, two on experiments in sound, one on megaphones, and two on hoisting machines. The three remaining numbers for the year appeared at somewhat irregular intervals. Number V appeared late in March, 1717. Number VI, after long delay, finally appeared October, 1718. On December 8, 1718, he wrote: "With *Dœdalus,* part VII, I will wait until his Majesty provides the means, which, I understand, will be forthcoming; I have everything ready to complete the second year." Unknown to Swedenborg when he wrote this, Charles XII had been killed in the assault upon Frederickshall, November 30th. As Swedenborg seems to have exhausted his own resources in publishing the previous numbers, number VII never appeared.

The plan and proposed contents of the *Dœdalus* together with some account of the circumstances of its origin may be fittingly given in Swedenborg's own words. In his dedication to the King, he writes:

> In venturing to publish some small mathematical experiments and observations, . . . I am encouraged by the gracious solicitude Your Royal Majesty has been pleased to bestow upon literary arts in general and on mathematical studies in particular; in evidence of this interest Your Royal Majesty has always graciously regarded the devices and machines which Assessor Polheim has already constructed, or in regard to which he has humbly submitted proposals, for the service and use of Your Royal Majesty and Your Kingdom.
>
> Some of these I have already described in the following little volume; and I have added the observations of some other learned men, subjects of Your Royal Majesty, besides my own experiments, which I have endeavored to perfect through earnest study both at home and during five years of expensive journeys in those countries where mathematical studies are most cultivated and valued.
>
> Most Gracious King, the present work is only a beginning; much more still remains stored away, which will be of great benefit to Your Royal Majesty's kingdom, especially for the improvement of manufactures, navigation, and artilleries.

The emphasis upon mathematics and the reference to Polhem may have been designed to attract the King's attention, and to secure his interest. The mention of his own experiments might well excite the King's curiosity, and enlist his personal sympathy. Swedenborg was much impressed by the backwardness of mathematics and the natural sciences in his country, and was constantly at work on plans and methods for promoting them. This was the design of the *Dædalus*.

In the address to the "Kind Reader," which prefaced the first issue, he gives a fuller statement. He says in the course of this preface:

> That which is here brought forth to the light of day is the fruit, and as it were the first born, of correspondence between some learned men, lovers of mathematical sciences in Upsala, and our Swedish Archimedes, Assessor Christopher Polheim. . . . . Some learned men in Upsala for a period of five years have compared their thoughts by letters as was said, with those of the above mentioned Herr Polheim, and have received his replies. In these replies many profound opinions have been stated, and new experiments, inventions, and machines have been described, shedding light not only on mechanics in general, but also on physics both in general and in particular, on astronomy, and also on economics; in these fields, people as a rule attempt nothing beyond what has been established once for all, each one thinking that to be good enough which his father and mother had done before.
>
> Foreigners for the most part are of the opinion that our northern and cold countries are but little inclined towards the mathematical sciences; but herein they judge blindly, having been led to think thus because they have had more opportunity and encouragement to cultivate these sciences, and because of this they have accomplished more. Their societies, or assemblies of the learned, are certainly to be commended, in which each and every one is at liberty to give expression to a new opinion, to compare it with others, and finally to publish it when it has been proven to be well founded.
>
> We also hope for such a condition when the Supreme Ruler grants to our incomparable monarch peace and tranquillity from his many and bitter enemies. In the meantime, it is proposed to publish something every two or three months; sometimes in regard to mechanics, concerning new machines for lifting weights, for

pumping water, concerning clocks, etc.; sometimes in regard to astronomy, in which our northern observations are so remarkably suited to throw light upon those made in southern lands; sometimes in regard to economics, concerning the construction of houses, the making of stoves and ovens, etc.

We see from this statement that in Swedenborg's view the scientific activities which had their outcome in the *Dædalus* went back to the time when his journey abroad landed him in England. Although he does not mention himself, the correspondence among the learned was for the most part that carried on between him and the learned Eric Benzelius. A few of the professors at the University of Upsala were drawn into it, and probably the great engineer Polhem had an important part in it. But after all, the young Swedenborg, just out of college, was the leading spirit. While he was busying himself with books and instruments to send to his university, his head was teeming with ideas about promoting the arts and sciences in his own country. Later, he was advocating, if he did not originate, plans for establishing a society in physics and mathematics, a professorship in mechanics, and an astronomical observatory. His interest in the arts of manufacturing as well as in the progress of science grew steadily, and he became one of the foremost advocates of economic and industrial reform and development.

We see also that he was wide awake to the advanced position of the arts and sciences in other countries. He probably had especially in mind what he saw in England and France. He was quite unreconciled to the position of inferiority in which he found his countrymen, and he had positive views about the relation between northern and southern countries as to astronomical advantages. He inherited his father's character as a reformer and as an energetic worker for the public good. This was shown in his interest in mechanical inventions and improvements.

A glance at the table of contents of the *Dædalus* shows a wide range of scientific interest. We may group the

topics as follows: (1) various forms of ear-trumpet, and a megaphone; (2) experiments on sounds; (3) hoisting machines; (4) air pumps; (5) a flying machine; (6) manufacture of salt; (7) problems of resistance in the case of air, snow, and water, and of falling bodies; (8) various modes of measurement and of calculation; (9) various experiments; (10) Vallerius's observation of the eclipse of the sun, April 22, 1715; (11) method of finding longitude; (12) on tremulation. Of this material, the greater part was contributed by Swedenborg himself. Polhem was a regular contributor, though his articles appeared as revised and enlarged by Swedenborg, sometimes with elaborate mathematical calculations and proofs. The experiments with the ear-trumpets and on sound, and those on resistance and on falling bodies, were made by Polhem, but they were described by Swedenborg. In fact, Swedenborg and Polhem conducted the magazine jointly, with the very material help and advice of Benzelius. Charles XII became interested in Swedenborg partly through the *Dædalus* and partly through his own aptitude for mathematics. This led him to appoint Swedenborg as Polhem's assistant and as a member of the College of Mines. Swedenborg and Polhem were closely associated personally and professionally; they were friends, and cherished a mutual, high admiration for each other.

It is to be regretted that only a few of the articles of the *Dædalus* have been translated into English. We are indebted to Professor Reginald W. Brown of Bryn Athyn, Pa., for the translation of the whole of number I. In this we have the account of Polhem's construction of the ear-trumpet, and of his experiments in sound; also an account of hoisting machines invented by Swedenborg. In the case of ear-trumpets of several kinds, Swedenborg worked out the geometrical and mathematical details of the construction, but the case is of subordinate scientific interest; perhaps it is chiefly significant for us in showing Swedenborg's disposition to proceed with mathematical thoroughness. In

the case of the experiments in sound, the scientific interest is greater. Swedenborg has frequently spoken of experiments, which presumably he was making; but he has not told us just what the experiments were. Now, however, he recites the precise experiments; and we have our first glimpse of his experimental habit. The article is headed: "Assessor Polheim's Experiments on the Nature of Sound." He begins as follows:

> Among the many letters it has pleased the Assessor to send to the members of the Society referred to above, there is one addressed to the librarian *Eric Benzelius,* in which there are described experiments on the nature of sound; and it is hoped that if such things are published, they may in the future be of use to illustrate other instruments and inventions. Now as the course of hearing and of sound may be best compared to the undulations and waves of water caused by motion, these experiments are as follows.

Then he goes on to give ten experiments, all meant to show the properties of sound and the properties of wave-motion. His interest in wave-motion is the thing of most significance here. He connects water waves with sound waves and light waves, and discusses the mathematical properties of wave motion in general. After dealing with these experiments, he goes on to suggest other experiments that have to be made to determine more fully the nature of sound. Accordingly he says:

> Before the nature and quality that is hidden in sound and its propagation can be further described, some experiments must be mentioned that may be conveniently made in our country. It is our intention hereafter always to present something which may also stimulate the diligence and desire of others; and moreover we propose to demonstrate that our country presents more abundant opportunities for making experiments than others. Such experiments may afterwards serve to improve our machines, and besides be productive of remarkable things, which may be useful as well to foreign learned societies as to our own country.

There follows a list of seven experiments. They are designed to show the rapidity of air waves, the speed of propagation, the quality and volume of sound under various

conditions, and other properties. It is noteworthy that he has a practical as well as a scientific interest in this experimentation; he wants it to result in the improvement of machines, and also to be of scientific value both to foreign learned societies and to his own country.

The megaphone and the hoisting machines were Swedenborg's inventions; and though they involved the application of his mechanical principles, they were important for practical purposes.

Of the remaining numbers of the *Dædalus*, only one has been translated into English, that on the flying machine. In 1910, the Swedenborg Scientific Association published two accounts of the flying machine: one from the manuscript in the Library of Linköping, which preserved the papers of Eric Benzelius together with letters and papers of Swedenborg; the other from the *Dædalus*. The translation was done by Hugo and Carl T. Odhner, accompanied by an historical introduction by the veteran Swedenborg editor, Professor Alfred Acton, who gives what is known about the history of the two accounts. The manuscript seems to be one of the scraps of paper which Swedenborg was putting in order during his stay in Rostoc and Greifswalde, some of which he sent to Benzelius. So it appears that this was the original of the discovery. The other was the form which appeared in the *Dædalus*, and consequently the more recent and presumably the more complete account. The two together make about five octavo pages. It is a little difficult to follow the description without the aid of the diagram, but the general features of the machine are fairly plain.

First of all we have a square box made of suitable material, and of size and strength sufficient to hold a man without danger. Then we have a broad oval sail suitably attached to the body. Thirdly, we have two wings placed between the two sides of the sails, and worked by springs. The whole is placed on rollers, and a central beam projects downwards to help keep the machine in a horizontal posi-

tion. Swedenborg thought a strong wind was needed to raise the machine and keep it going. We see that his machine was not far different in outline from our present-day monoplane, with its engine in place of the springs. Swedenborg appends to the account in the *Dædalus* Polhem's objections and criticisms. The point of them seems to have been that, like perpetual motion and the production of gold, it was against nature. His mechanical objection was based on the principle that the weight of materials increases faster than the strength, and therefore the comparison with birds was irrelevant.

Swedenborg quotes Fontenelle playfully, but really much to the point. Fontenelle says:

> The art of flying is hardly yet born. It will be perfected, and some day people will fly up to the moon. Do we pretend to have discovered everything, or to have brought our knowledge to a point where nothing can be added to it. Oh, for mercy's sake, let us agree that there is still something to do for the ages to come.

Swedenborg was more in sympathy with Fontenelle than was Polhem, and had the inventor's anticipation of the future.

In a letter written to Swedenborg from Stiernsund in March, 1716, Polhem mentions a letter from the King instructing him to come to Carlscrona to do some needed engineering work; but the journey was postponed. In the following September, still writing from Stiernsund, he says:

> Your arrival in Stiernsund will be most agreeable to me, and if my experience can be of any use to you, I will give it with so much the greater pleasure, as the fruit of it will be of use to the public and will accrue to my own honor. After you enter upon Physics, it might be useful to follow them up for some time more extensively, especially those which concern the *causes of natural things,* and also other things necessary and curious, especially those of the household, etc.

In December, Swedenborg writes to Benzelius:

> We arrived here at Carlscrona a few days ago, intending after a few weeks to go to Gottenburg, and afterwards to Trollhätta, Lakes Wener and Hjelmar, and Gullspangelf, in order to examine

sites for sluices and locks; a plan which meets with His Majesty's approbation.

In the same letter, he speaks of having written from Lund, where he spent at least three weeks, in attendance upon the King. We gather from these items that Swedenborg paid the visit to Polhem at Stiernsund after September 5, and that later he and Polhem went to Lund at the King's command. This seems to have been the beginning of their working together as engineers in the King's service; and this association continued up to the time of the King's death. The greater part of this time was spent in constructing a canal between Lakes Wener and Wetter, with the idea of ultimately connecting the North and Baltic Seas. The idea was first suggested, it seems, by Bishop Brask in a letter to Ture Jönsson. Benzelius says:

> Of this letter, I gave a copy to my brother-in-law, Mr. Emanuel Swedberg, during his stay at Lund, in 1716, in the suite of the King, and it was the occasion of directing attention to the plan of building a canal between Lakes Wener and Wetter, and of making the river from Gottenburg to Lake Wener navigable; all this, however, was stopped by the King's death.

It appears, then, that it was Swedenborg who took this plan directly to the King, and secured the King's interest in it; and this in all probability was the beginning of the King's interest in Swedenborg as a practical engineer. At any rate, from this time on Swedenborg was engaged in public employment, first as Polhem's assistant, and then as government mining engineer.

On this occasion also, Swedenborg seems to have made his first personal acquaintance with the King. During the next two years he occasionally mentions friendly conversations with the King, especially on the subject of mathematics; the King also showed much interest in the *Dædalus*. Their first interview seems to have taken place at Lund. In a letter to Benzelius, Swedenborg gives the following account of the King's friendly manner:

> I wrote you a letter from Lund, and should have written to you

more frequently, had I not been prevented by my mechanical and other occupations; moreover, I had enough to attend to in order to accomplish my design. Since His Majesty graciously looked at my *Dædalus* and its plan, he has advanced me to the post of an extraordinary assessor in the College of Mines; yet in such a way, that I should for some time attend the Councillor of Commerce, Polheimer. What pleases me most is, that His Majesty pronounced so favorable and gracious a judgment respecting me, and himself defended me against those who thought the worst of me; and that he has since promised me his further favor and protection—of this I have been assured both directly and indirectly. But let me tell you all in more detail: After His Majesty had sufficiently inquired as to my character, studies, and the like, and as I was so fortunate as to have good references, he offered me three posts and offices to choose from, and afterwards gave me the warrant for the rank and post of an extraordinary assessor. But as my enemies had played too many intrigues with the above-mentioned warrant, and had couched it in ambiguous terms, I sent it back to His Majesty with some comments, well knowing whom I had to depend upon, when there was immediately granted me a new one, and likewise a gracious letter to the College of Mines. My opponent had to sit down at the King's own table, and write this out in duplicate in two forms, of which the King selected the best; so that those who had sought to injure me, were glad to escape with honor and reputation; they had so nearly burnt their fingers.

*Dædalus* has enjoyed the favor of lying these three weeks upon His Majesty's table, and has furnished matter for many discussions and questions; it has also been shown by His Majesty to many persons.

[Carlscrona, Dec., 1716.]

In this first-hand account of the circumstances of his appointment, it is plain that Swedenborg had acquired an assured position in the esteem of the King, and that he was ready and able to hold his own in the face of Court intrigue. The King's letter to the College of Mines, and the warrant of the appointment are interesting historical documents. According to the minutes of the College, the letter was received December 29, and was read and put on file January 7, 1717. It is given in full in Tafel's "Documents Concerning Swedenborg," as follows:

Charles, by the grace of God, King of Sweden, Gothia, and

Wendia, etc. Our especial favor and gracious pleasure, under God Almighty, to the true men and servants, to our Council and President, as well as Vice-President, and to all the members of the College of Mines. Inasmuch as we have graciously designed to command that Emanuel Swedberg shall be Extraordinary Assessor in the College of Mines, although he is at the same time to attend Polhammar, the counsellor of commerce, and to be of assistance to him in his engineering works, and in carrying out his designs, therefore it is our good pleasure hereby to let you know this, with our gracious command, and that you will allow him to enjoy a seat and voice in the College, whenever he is present, and especially when any business be brought forward pertaining to mechanics. We hereby commend you, especially and graciously, to God Almighty.

Carolus
S. Cronhjelm.

Lund, December 18, 1716.

This letter is important testimony to Swedenborg's ability as an engineer and mathematician. The appointment was made on the express condition that he should remain with Polhem to assist him in his engineering work, and also for the purpose of having a man who was competent in mechanics on the Board. It put Swedenborg in two advanced positions of the public service, and gave him a high official standing.

The Royal Warrant is preserved in the College of Mines, and a copy is given in Tafel's "Documents." It was presented and read before the College on April 6, 1717. Inasmuch as it marks the beginning of Swedenborg's official career, it is herewith given for its historic interest:

We, Charles, by the Grace of God, King of Sweden, etc. . . . make known, that, inasmuch as we have graciously thought fit any one who possesses a good knowledge of mechanics ought to sit in the College of Mines, and inasmuch as for this purpose there was proposed to us in all deference, our faithful subject, and our well-beloved Emanuel Swedberg, on account of his praiseworthy qualities and eminent fitness; therefore, we herewith, and by virtue of this our open warrant, graciously deign to direct, that this Emanuel Swedberg shall be Extraordinary Assessor in our College of Mines. All this is to be duly noticed by all whom

it may concern. In order to impart additional weight to it, we have confirmed it by our signature and our royal seal.

Carolus,
S. Cronhjelm.

Lund, December 18, 1716.

When the warrant was read, the following minute was entered:

April 6, 1. Inasmuch as Mr. Emanuel Swedberg, who was appointed by His Royal Majesty to be Extraordinary Assessor in the College of Mines, has now made his appearance; therefore, as the beginning of his introduction, the royal decree which had been received, was read. Afterwards, the above named Assessor, after delivering to the Royal College the formulary of the oath signed by himself, took the oath of loyalty and of office, with his hand upon the book, and then took the seat belonging to him.

It seems that he attended the regular meetings of the College from April 6 to April 17. He writes from Stockholm, April 4, "In a fortnight from yesterday I intend to leave." Again we find it entered as minute 2 of the College, April 17, that:

Assessors Johan Angerstein and Emanuel Swedberg gave notice that they were obliged to depart, the former only for a week to Strengnäs; the latter, in company with Councillor of Commerce Polheimer, to Carlscrona and Schonen. Whereupon the College could scarcely do otherwise than give its consent.

As Extraordinary Assessor, Swedenborg had the privilege of attending the sessions of the College at his pleasure, and as a matter of fact it was several years before he attended regularly.

It seems that after taking leave of the College of Mines, Swedenborg went direct to Upsala and paid a visit to Benzelius and his family, and as usual was welcomed as a member of the household. Thence he went to Lund where he remained for more than six weeks in attendance upon the King. While at Lund, he wrote a letter to Benzelius, June 26, 1717, which is full of personal interest, and gives us a glimpse of his varied activities at this time. It is worth quoting as a whole:

Most honored friend and brother,

Since I left Upsala I have returned you neither thanks nor anything else for your late hospitable reception. You will no doubt have been told the reason why I departed so hastily from Ribbingbeck without taking leave. Five weeks ago, after I came here to Lund, I presented to His Majesty *Dædalus,* part V, and he was pleased, yea, more than pleased with it. The plan respecting the Observatory, I have communicated only to Secretary Cederholm, but I found him cold and indifferent about it, inasmuch as it does not emanate directly from the faculty at Upsala; we shall have to wait therefore for an opportunity. The Councillor of Commerce Polhem has resolved to trouble himself about nothing, except what concerns himself; since he has noticed that many new things are given into his charge, about which he has no knowledge whatever. Still the salt boiling will go on, His Majesty having resolved to grant great and important privileges, which will perhaps induce many zealous persons to venture their means in the affair; and should there be a scarcity of shareholders in other places, Lund with its attorneys may perhaps do the most. The establishment of canal locks between Gottenburg and Wenersborg, is also in good trim. I have besides been busy with a new method of counting, which His Majesty has hit upon, viz., to let the numeration reach 64 before it turns, in the same way as the ordinary methods of counting turns at ten. He has himself devised new characters, new names, etc., for this purpose; and has written and changed a number of points with his own hand. This paper, which I have in my possession, will in time deserve a distinguished place in a library. This method of counting is difficult in multiplication, etc.; but it is useful and speedy in division, in the extraction of the square, cube, and biquadratic roots, all of which terminate in 64; as well as in the solution of smaller numbers. His Majesty has great penetration.

With a thousand remembrances to sister Anna, and little brother Eric, I remain, honored and dear brother,

Your most faithful brother,

Eman. Swedberg.

Lund, June 26, 1717.

P. S. I wrote the preceding for the last post. The privileges of the Salt Company have since been signed; they are fairly advantageous, as those who wish to interest themselves with the Councillor of Commerce in a Salt Company, have liberty to purchase any forest that can be bought, and to select any place they choose; are exempt from taxation for twenty years, and are subsequently

never to be charged more than half the duty which is levied on foreign salt. The Company has since been formed, and consists of 200,000 shares of one mark in silver. No other Company is allowed to report itself before the last day of September. Many more privileges are promised, as they may be required. Should any one in Upsala wish to join it, he can do so through Assessor Cameen in Stockholm, within that time. Here we have already issued from 30,000 to 40,000 shares, and according to all appearances the shares will be taken within the specified term. The whole amount will be 50,000 dalers in silver. I shall probably proceed next week to Warberge, Uddewalla, and Strömstad, to select suitable places. In the meantime remember me to all good friends.

P. S. We shall leave here in eight days. How does *Dædalus*, part VI, get on? I have spoken twice with Attorney Liljenstedt about Dr. Rudbeck's yachts; he has promised to do his very best, and said that he has already several times made application for them.

There are several points of special interest in this letter. It presents Swedenborg in the unusual and unexpected light of an active promoter of business enterprises. He had an inherited and personal interest in mines, and he had given much time and attention to studying and observing mining sites and mining operations. His mind was ever alert to discover and initiate public improvements of every kind. While he was making himself familiar with the mining districts, he was on the watch for other industrial opportunities. Among such opportunities, he recognized the manufacture of salt as one of the most important. When he found that the King was interested, he went to work with his usual systematic industry to acquire minute information about proper sites and the details of the process, and as usual he was ready with new inventions and improvements. He thought it would "profit the country more than the whole of its iron manufacturing," and "would be a real gain, as the money would remain in the country." He was now active in forming the company, but it does not appear that he was directly interested financially. He advocated the enterprise with a full stock of information, but things

did not go to his liking. He looked to Polhem as the proper leader and manager of the business, but began to suspect that self-interest was entering and leading to mismanagement. The fact seems to have been that he knew more of all the details of salt manufacturing than any one else connected with the enterprise, but was not allowed to have his way or to have his ideas worked out.

Another item of interest was his working with the King on a new method of counting. This was the method of making 64 instead of 10 the base of the system. In other words, they would count up to 64 as we do to 10, and then begin again. Later they took 8 instead of 64 as the base, and this seems to have been Swedenborg's proposal. He took this proposal quite seriously, and prepared an article on it for publication. Later, in a letter to Dr. Nordberg, he gave an extended account of discussions with Charles XII on this method, and expressed great admiration of the King's mathematical ability. The letter was incorporated in Nordberg's "History of Charles XII," and thus passed into general circulation. Christian Wolf, in his *Elementa Matheseos Universæ,* mentions that "Charles XII, King of Sweden, according to Emanuel Swedenborg, has invented a sexagenary calculus, with new characters and figures, and adding new values." Wolf is referring to the article in the "Miscellaneous Observations."

We are at a disadvantage in not having the original papers of the King's development of the sexagenary system, and Swedenborg's own development of the octonary system. In spite of some advantages, these systems have never been serious rivals of the decimal system, which secures the value of position by the use of zero. Nevertheless they are curious experiments, and help us to grasp the nature of counting more objectively. We are so accustomed to the decimal system that it seems natural and unavoidable. As a matter of fact, it is supposed that the octonary system preceded the decimal in time. In other words, men first counted on their fingers without using the thumbs.

As a matter of more general and scientific interest, the letter shows that Swedenborg is pressing his design of having an observatory established. This was a part of his educational scheme, which included a chair in mathematics and a mechanical department in the University of Upsala, also a chair in the Swedish language. These advanced educational ideas put Swedenborg ahead of even his educated countrymen, and served to impress him with the loneliness of his position; Benzelius seems to have been the one man in high position who fully sympathized with him, and gave him his constant support. We see too that *Dædalus,* Part V, is at last in print; and that, owing to the pressure of other interests and duties, it is getting more and more difficult for him to give the necessary time to the preparation of further material. We are not surprised to learn that Part VI did not appear until a year later, in October 1718, and that Part VII, though the material was in hand, never appeared at all.

What Swedenborg says about Charles XII, and of their cordial relations, throws a strong light on his own personality. It shows that he was fully able to cope with the King's arbitrary temper and erratic brilliancy. This argued a penetrating and well disciplined mind under good control, a quick discernment and a high proficiency in mathematics and mechanics, and in the physical sciences. The King himself, Swedenborg testifies, had extraordinary penetration, and a rare gift for solving mathematical problems intuitively. It was no small achievement, therefore, to win his confidence and admiration. Even more important is Polhem's testimony to Swedenborg's readiness and proficency in mathematics and mechanics. To these he added the inventor's zeal for new discoveries and improvements, and the student's thirst for knowledge.

As the burden of the *Dædalus* was more and more put aside, and his engineering employment became more and more fitful, he devoted more time to study, observation, and experiment. While traveling over the country, he observed

closely, noted the geological features, and in this way became familiar with the geology of a large part of Sweden. After his appointment to the position of Extraordinary Assessor in the College of Mines, he visited constantly the mining regions, and studied mining operations and everything connected with them; such as the sites, the machines and implements used, the nature and properties of the metals, and especially of fire, and so passed on to a more experimental and systematic study of physics and chemistry. Meanwhile, as he studied, observed, and experimented, he gave more time to writing out his results. During this period he prepared quite a body of essays on various subjects in the field of natural science. Some of these he published; some still lie in manuscript; some are no longer extant.

Hyde's "Bibliography of Swedenborg's Works" enumerates about forty pieces written between 1716 and 1720, including several good-sized books. They are as follows:

1. Youth's Honor, Arith. Geom. Alg. 1716. Not extant.
2. Perspective. 1716. Not extant.
3. Society of Sciences. 1716. Pp. I.
4. Soils and Muds. 1716. Pp. I. Transl. into English.
5. Fossils. 1716. Pp. I. (See Misc. Obs. Pt. I, pp. 3, 4.)
6. Flying Machine. 1716. Pp. I. Transl.
7. Siphon. 1716.
8. Sailing up Stream. 1716. Pp. 3.
9. Experiments. 1716. Pp. I.
10. Screw-jack. 1716. Pp. 3.
11. Stereometry. 1716. Pp. 2.
12. Crane. 1716. Pp. 3.
13. Echo. 1716. Pp. 2.
14. Causes of Things. 1717. Pp. 4. Transl. Stroh.
15. Salt Boileries. 1717. Pp. 4.
16. Tin Work. 1717. Pp. 3.
17. Stoppage of Earth. 1717. Pp. 38. (See No. 27 below.)
18. Improvements at Carlscrona. 1717. Pp. 4.
19. Instituting an Observatory. 1717. Pp. 4.

20. Commerce and Manufacturing. 1717. Pp. 6. (Establish public trading company.) [*Phil.*, Ap. 1905. T.
21. Fire and Colors. 1717. Pp. 5. Transl. Odhner, *New*
22. Mussels, Snails, etc. 1717. Pp. 1. Transl. Stroh.
23. Algebra. 1718. Pp. 135. Acad. Lib. [Treatises.
24. Method of Finding Longitude. 1718. Pp. 38.
25. New Arithmetic. 1718. Pp. 28. Misc. Obs. Pt. IV.
26. Literary Society. 1718. Pp. I. [Letter to Nordberg.
27. Welfare of the Country. 1718. Pp. 12.
28. Essence of Nature. 1718. Pp. 32.
29. Earth's Revolution. 1719. Pp. 38. Transl.
30. Height of Water. 1719. Pp. 19. Transl. *Int. Rep.* IV. 1819. Treat. [Odhner, Tremulation.
31. Motive and Vital Essence. 1719. Pp. 50. Transl.
32. Blast Furnaces. 1719. Pp. 86. (See Misc. Obs. pp.
33. Money and Measures. 1719. Pp. 7.[137-46. Doc. 145.)
34. New Ways of Discovering Mines. 1719 Pp. 14. Transl. *New Phil.*, Oct. 1906.
35. Docks, Sluices, and Salt Works. 1719. Pp. 8.
36. Geometry, Algebra, Diff. and Int. Calculus, etc. 1719. Pp. 399. [Stroh, Treat.
37. Falling and Rising of Lake Wener. 1720. Pp. 7. Transl.
38. Indications of a Deluge. 1721. Pp. 4. Transl. Misc. Obs. Letter to Melle.

This list is a good indication of the variety and extent of Swedenborg's scientific and literary activities before the time when he began to devote himself systematically to the philosophy of nature. Evidently, he was following out the many various impulses of his scientific curiosity and his immense intellectual energy. The list may be conveniently summarized under the head of the general subjects treated. We have: (1) Geological, (2) Physical, (3) Astronomical, (4) Mechanical, (5) Mathematical, (6) Educational, (7) Political, (8) Economic, (9) Manufacturing, (10) Commercial, (11) Physiological, and (12) Philosophical.

Lewis F. Hite.

# EMERSON AND THE DOCTRINE OF CORRESPONDENCE. IV.

## Correspondence and Mysticism.

By Clarence Hotson, Ph. D.[1]

IN my article, "Emerson's Title for Swedenborg,"[2] I showed how Emerson came to apply the epithet "mystic" to Swedenborg. In the correct, technical sense of the word, of course, Emerson was himself a mystic. In this part of my essay I shall show what special meaning Emerson placed upon the word "mystic," and how he tried to justify his relegation of Swedenborg to a class in which he himself, evidently, did not choose to be included.

In his "Journal," November 25, 1838, Emerson wrote:

> How incalculable and potent seem to me the strokes and glances of a few mystics, saints and philosophers whom I have seen and reverenced, living within the veil of their sanctuaries! . . .
>
> Swedenborg taught *ab intra*. . . . How great the influence of such! how it rebukes, how it invites and raises me! My soul answers them saying, "So it is, even as I have heard: it is no dream: God is; and there is a heaven for his saints; and that heaven is obedience to him. I hear ye what ye say, great servants of my Lord! I also believe; Lord, help mine unbelief!" (J. V, 143-4, 145.)

The setting of this "Journal" comment shows that Emerson took from it a passage he later used in "The Over-Soul."[3] In the published passage, however, he left out the name of Swedenborg, and made a much less respectful comment on mystics:

---

[1] The author acknowledges the courtesy of Houghton Mifflin Company in permitting the use of certain copyrighted matter.

[2] *New-Church Life*, July, 1929.

[3] Essays, First Series, 1841.

> The great distinction between teachers sacred or literary,— . . . between men of the world who are reckoned accomplished talkers, and here and there a fervent mystic, prophesying half insane under the infinitude of his thought,—is that one class speak *from within,* or from experience, as parties and possessors of the fact; and the other class *from without,* as spectators merely, or perhaps as acquainted with the fact on the evidence of third persons. (Centenary, II, 287.)

As this remark about insanity in connection with mysticism shows, Emerson did not, in the works he himself published, choose to confess his own mysticism directly, or under that designation. We must remember that he had a family to support.

In "The Poet"[4] he attempted to frame a quasi-definition of mysticism in such a way that he might himself escape or evade the designation "mystic," while generously bestowing that epithet on Swedenborg:

> Here is the difference betwixt the poet and the mystic, that the last nails a symbol to one sense, which was a true sense for a moment, but soon becomes old and false. . . . Mysticism consists in the mistake of an accidental and individual symbol for an universal one. (Centenary, III, 34.)

In a note on this passage, Emerson's editor says:

> Much to this purpose is in the earlier lecture on "The Poet," as, "Swedenborg had this vice, that he nailed one sense to each image, —one and no more." (Centenary, III, 300.)

Apparently, then, it is not enough to be merely insane in order to be a mystic. In "Swedenborg," moreover, Emerson announced the remarkable discovery that the mystic has an exclusively theological bias; for immediately after quoting, apparently with full approval, Swedenborg's statement that the reason why all things are representative is that they exist from influx of the Lord through heaven, Emerson in the next sentence blamed Swedenborg for continually exhibiting the relation of correspondence in an exclusively "theologic" direction:

---

[4] Essays, Second Series, 1844.

This design of exhibiting such correspondences, which, if adequately executed, would be the poem of the world,. . . was narrowed and defeated by the exclusively theologic direction which his inquiries took. His perception of nature is not human and universal, but is mystical and Hebraic. (Centenary, IV, 120-1.)

Just as though Swedenborg, after having, with Emerson's apparent approval, assigned the Divine influx as the sole ground of this relation of correspondence, could ever logically or consistently have left the Divine out of account in his "poem of the world." Swedenborg was too "narrow" to forget the Lord, or to bother with any God-less system of symbolism.

Emerson, however, had himself written in his Journal, April 2, 1836:

The common sense of man requires that, at last, nature be referred to the Deity, be viewed in God. (J. IV, 36.)

And between June 24 and July 2, 1836, he wrote:

Nature is the projection of God. It is the expositor of the Divine Mind. (J. IV, 76.)

These statements sound somewhat theologic to me. And in "Nature" Emerson wrote:

This relation between the mind and matter is not fancied by some poet, but stands in the will of God, and so is free to be known by all men. (Centenary, I, 33-34.)

Therefore, Emerson continued, is Nature ever the ally of Religion: lends all her pomp and riches to the religious sentiment, and echoes the Ten Commandments. (*Ibid.*, I, 41.) Isn't that mention of the Commandments just a bit "Hebraic"? He also, it appears, could on occasion be "theologic" enough to mention God in relation to the doctrine of correspondence:

There seems to be a necessity in spirit to manifest itself in material forms; and day and night, river and storm, beast and bird, acid and alkali, preëxist in necessary Ideas in the mind of God, and are what they are by virtue of preceding affections in the world of spirit. A Fact is the end or last issue of spirit. (Centenary, I, 34.)

This also seems somewhat theologic, if not "mystical." So also does this, which he wrote in the same essay:

> Spirit creates; . . . behind nature, throughout nature, spirit is present; one and not compound it does not act upon us from without, that is, in space and time, but spiritually, or through ourselves: therefore . . . spirit, that is, the Supreme Being, does not build up nature around us, but puts it forth through us, as the life of the tree puts forth new branches and leaves through the pores of the old. As a plant upon the earth, so man rests upon the bosom of God. (*Ibid,* 63-4.)

In his "Journal," July 30, 1836, Emerson had written:

> The Idealist says, God paints the world around your soul. The spiritualist saith, Yea, but lo! God is within you. The self of self creates the world through you. (J. IV, 78.)

If this Emersonian perception of nature is human and universal, and not mystical and Hebraic, what is the matter with Swedenborg's? But though Emerson can mention God without becoming narrow, theologic, mystical, Gothic or Hebraic, Swedenborg cannot do so without becoming all of these things. In "Swedenborg" Emerson brought in his other characteristic of mysticism (aside from insanity). and mechanically combined the two:

> He fastens each natural object to a theologic notion;—a horse signifies carnal understanding; a tree, perception; the moon, faith; a cat means this; an ostrich that; an artichoke this other;—and poorly tethers every symbol to a several ecclesiastic sense. (Centenary, IV, 121.)

I showed in my article "Sampson Reed, A Teacher of Emerson"[5] that Emerson got his "horse signifies carnal understanding" from Reed's lecture "Remains,"[6] and that he read Reed's extract from "Apocalypse Revealed," No. 611, rather carelessly.

"A tree, perception," Emerson took, apparently, from "Heavenly Arcana," Boston, 1837, at number 102:

> A tree signifies perception. (H. A., I, 43.)

---

[5] *New England Quarterly,* April, 1929.

[6] *New Jerusalem Magazine,* March, 1842.

"The moon, faith," Emerson took from the same source, at number 32:

> By the sun is here meant, love . . . by the moon, faith. (H. A., I, 15.)

The cat, ostrich, and artichoke, of course, were Emerson's own contributions, in an evident attempt to be facetious. Much funnier, however, is what he said right afterward:

> The slippery Proteus is not so easily caught. In nature, each individual symbol plays innumerable parts, as each particle of matter circulates in turn through every system. The central identity enables any one symbol to express successively all the qualities and shades of real being. In the transmission of the heavenly waters, every hose fits every hydrant.[7] (Centenary, IV, 121.)

It is true, of course, that Swedenborg used his symbols consistently and systematically, and thus made sure of being intelligible to anyone who finds out what meaning he attached to a given symbol in a given context; whereas Emerson's poet, constantly using each symbol in a different sense, would make sure of being unintelligible. His poet is more mystical, by far, in the sense of being mystifying, than is Swedenborg. Persons who wish to understand what they read will, I should think, prefer Swedenborg's so-called vice to Emerson's poet's so-called virtue.

Let us see what Emerson's hose-and-hydrant doctrine would do to his earlier statement. In "Nature" (1836) he wrote:

> Every natural fact is a symbol of some spiritual fact. Every appearance in nature corresponds to some state of the mind, and that state of the mind can only be described by presenting that natural appearance as its picture. An enraged man is a lion, a cunning man is a fox, a firm man is a rock, a learned man is a torch. A lamb is innocence; a snake is subtle spite. (Centenary, I, 26.)

---

[7] In his "Journal," between May 3 and June 7, 1845, Emerson used this hose-and-hydrant metaphor apparently for the first time. (J. VII, 60.) He used it again October, 1848 (J. VII, 523), and in "Natural History of Intellect." (Centenary, XII, 20.)

Here Emerson fastened each natural object he mentioned, if not to a theologic, at least to a particular notion. If, however, he was right in his "slippery Proteus" criticism, he should have written the passage something like this:

> Every natural fact is a symbol of every spiritual fact. Every appearance in nature corresponds to every state of the mind, and any state of the mind can be described by presenting any old natural appearance as its picture. An enraged man is a fox, a cunning man is a lion, a firm man is a torch, a learned man is a rock. A snake is innocence; a lamb is subtle spite.

Why not, if "the central identity enables any one symbol to express successively all the qualities and shades of real being"? This necessary consequence of the hose-and-hydrant theory does not, however, greatly improve the original. I suspect that Emerson hatched the theory chiefly for the purpose of having some fault to find with Swedenborg touching his use of correspondence. He can not be greatly congratulated on his success. He continued:

> Nature avenges herself speedily on the hard pedantry that would chain her waves. She is no literalist. Every thing must be taken genially, and we must be at the top of our condition to understand anything rightly. (Centenary, IV, 121.)

One doubts if Emerson was at the top of his condition when he wrote this. The "Journal" passage which he wrote August 19, 1845, expressed quite a different idea:

> The world is enigmatical; everything said and everything known and done, and must not be taken literally, but genially. (J. VII, 80.)

Heretofore Swedenborg had been Emerson's great example of the prophetic mind that takes everything not literally, but genially, that is, spiritually or symbolically. Emerson's last sentence reappeared in "Works and Days" (Society and Solitude), a lecture he gave in 1857:

> The world is enigmatical,—everything said, and everything known or done,—and must not be taken literally, but genially. We must be at the top of our condition to understand anything rightly. (Centenary, VII, 180.)

Swedenborg can hardly be accused of taking the world literally. Why then did Emerson, in this lecture, imply that he was a literalist? Such behavior inclines one to take Emerson not genially, but literally, and with "hard pedantry" to expose his inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and absurdities.

In "Conduct of Life" (1860), Emerson said that Nature is "philosophy and theology embodied." (Centenary, VI, 49.) But in "Swedenborg" he said:

> His theological bias thus fatally narrowed his interpretation of nature, and the dictionary of symbols is yet to be written. But the interpreter whom mankind must still expect, will find no predecessor who has approached so near to the true problem. (Centenary, IV, 121.)

In the name of common sense, what possible need is there of a *dictionary* of symbols, if, as Emerson said above, every symbol can express every idea? One wonders what Emerson's wished-for dictionary would be like. He thought, apparently, that Swedenborg had nothing better to do than to write some non-theologic dictionary of symbols for the benefit of would-be poets. With Swedenborg, however, the doctrine of correspondence was chiefly a means to an end: the discovery and communication of spiritual truth (how "theological" soever) to the further end, not of amusing men or gratifying their curiosity, but of reforming their ideas and thereby their lives.

As to theological bias, Emerson wrote in his "Journal," June 21, 1838, that a fact is an Epiphany of God. (J. IV, 488.) He used this statement in "Education" in 1864. (Centenary, X, 132.) Why then, in the "Mystic," did he censure Swedenborg for treating a fact as such? In "Perpetual Forces" (1862) he said:

> The soul of God is poured into the world through the thoughts of men. The world stands on ideas. (Centenary, X, 88.)

Such a statement would apparently sanction considerable theological bias in one's view of the world. In "Country Life" (a lecture he gave in Boston, March, 1858) he said:

We might say, the Rock of Ages dissolves himself into the mineral air to build up this mystic constitution of man's mind and body. (Centenary, XII, 141.)

This passage explains some lines of verse he wrote:

Ever the Rock of Ages melts
Into the mineral air,
To be the quarry whence to build
Thought and its mansions fair.
(Centenary, IX, 355.)

The man who wrote this was himself, evidently, not altogether free from "theological bias."

Emerson's inconsistencies, though glaring, were not the result of inability to reason. He was trying to define mysticism in such a way that he could call Swedenborg a mystic without involving himself in the same designation. This effort accounts both for his queer definition and for the embarrassment into which it led him. He therefore defined Poetry as the general use of Nature symbolically to express ideas, and Mysticism as the use of Nature symbolically to express purely theologic ideas, by nailing each natural symbol to one special ecclesiastic sense. It is needless to say that Emerson has that made-to-order definition all to himself.

In a letter to Miss Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, August 3 or 4, 1835, Emerson wrote:

I like what you say of your aversion at being confined to Swedenborg's associations, and I confirm myself with similar declarations whenever my critical acumen . . . is at fault. (J. III, 531.)

No one, of course, need be confined to Swedenborg's associations of ideas with objects treated as symbols of spiritual concepts, except for one purpose: that of understanding what Swedenborg meant by what he wrote in his books. In his own books, however, Swedenborg is absolute. Whatever symbol he uses—a natural object, a Bible character, a doctrine, a tradition, or a person—means just what he makes it mean, and expresses whatever concept he

chooses to have it express. No one can hope adequately to understand his message without finding out from his own explanations, definitions, and usage of terms, what ideas he associated with the symbols he employed.

In his Journal, between September 1 and October 27, 1845, Emerson wrote:

> Swedenborg perceived the central life of each object and saw the change of appearance as it passed before different eyes. He does not seem to have seen with equal clearness the necessity of progression or onwardness in each creature. Metamorphosis is the law of the Universe. All forms are fluent. . . . The thoughts of God pause but for a moment in any form, but pass into a new form. (J. VII, 117.)

Emerson here objected to the very consistency and system without which Swedenborg's use of symbolism would have resulted in unintelligibility. Swedenborg had to attach a definite and particular meaning to each symbol in order to communicate an intelligible message. In his Journal, between May 1 and 23, 1846, Emerson wrote:

> The mystic labels and tickets one thing, or two. The mystic, who beholds the flux, yet becomes pragmatist on some one particular of faith, and, what is the mischief, seeks to accredit this new jail because it was builded by him who has demolished so many jails. (J. VII, 171.)

It is quite sufficient for the purpose of finding out what meaning Swedenborg attached to the words he used, to find out to what meaning he "nailed" each symbol. For this purpose it makes no difference whether his symbols were universal, or accidental and individual. By his definitions and explanations of terms, he gave to each of his symbols a meaning that allied it to the universal. By so doing an author can make even accidental and individual symbols convey universal meanings. Emerson's criticism thus ignores the only important question, which concerns not the symbolism, but the message it communicates.

In "The Poet," after saying that the mystic nails each symbol to one particular meaning, Emerson added:

And the mystic must be steadily told,—All that you say is just as true without the tedious use of that symbol as with it. Let us have a little algebra, instead of this trite rhetoric,—universal signs, instead of these village symbols,—and we shall both be gainers. (Centenary, III, 35.)

As the first three articles of this series abundantly prove, Emerson here contradicted much that he said, both before and after the date of "The Poet," on the whole subject of correspondence, and on the use of symbolism to express spiritual truth. In his Journal, between April 16 and 19, 1835, he had written:

The idealist must retain his thoughts until they embody themselves in fit outward illustrations. (J. III, 468.)

October 15, 1836, he wrote:

It is a necessity of the human nature that it should express itself outwardly and embody its thought. (J. IV, 118.)

And October 26, 1838, he wrote:

We must use the language of facts, and not be superstitiously abstract. (J. V, 102.)

Yet in "The Poet" Emerson blamed "the mystic" (meaning Swedenborg, chiefly) for clothing his thought in symbols, instead of always dealing in abstractions! As a matter of fact, however, Swedenborg could be on occasion as abstract as any heart could wish. August 2, 1835, Emerson wrote:

Vision regards the world as symbolical, and pierces the emblem for the real sense. Sees all external objects as types. (J. III, 525-6.)

October 28, 1835, he wrote:

Man stands on the point betwixt the inward spirit and the outward matter. He sees that the one explains, translates, the other; that the world is the mirror of the soul. He is the priest and interpreter of nature thereby. (J. III, 566.)

And November 6, 1835, he wrote:

Let a man make the woods and fields his books; then at the hour of passion his thoughts will invest themselves spontaneously with natural imagery. (J. III, 567.)

Had Emerson reflected or investigated, he must have realized that Swedenborg, by his explanations of terms, himself furnished the "algebraic or universal signs" into which his "village symbols" can be translated for the benefit of anyone who prefers to have truth stated abstractly. Yet the passages in his theological writings that interested Emerson were those in which Swedenborg clothed his teaching most pictorially and vividly in symbolism. In the very next paragraph of this essay "The Poet" Emerson referred with approval to some "Memorable Relations"[8] as examples of Swedenborg's tendency to translate nature into thought.

Emerson concluded the passage quoted above:

> The history of hierarchies seems to show that all religious error consisted in making the symbol too stark and solid, and was at last nothing but an excess of the organ of language. (Centenary, III, 35.)

What happens, rather, is that people regard the symbol not as a symbol of truth but as the truth itself. In "The Mystic" Emerson said about certain of Swedenborg's "Memorable Relations":

> These books should be used with caution. It is dangerous to sculpture these evanescing images of thought. True in transition, they become false if fixed. It requires, for his just apprehension, almost a genius equal to his own. . . . But these pictures are to be held as mystical, that is, as a quite arbitrary and accidental picture of the truth,—not as the truth. Any other symbol would be as good; then this is safely seen. (Centenary, IV, 132.)

How can anyone know what truth Swedenborg expressed by his pictures of the truth, accidental and arbitrary, or otherwise, without finding out what sense Swedenborg gave to his symbols?

In his "Journal," between December 1 and 8, 1839, Emerson wrote:

---

[8] See the third article of this series, in the *New-Church Review* for July, 1929.

It is very pleasant to me to hear of any fine person that he or she is a reader of Swedenborg. It is an uncomputed force,—his influence on this age, his genius still unmeasured. He is the fabulist, the Cebes, the better Aesop of the last ages. How bland, how warm, how renovating it works on the cold crudities of Calvinism or Unitarianism! (J. V, 350.)

Yet this parable-writing for which he praised Swedenborg in his private "Journals," he made the occasion of the most extreme disparagement in his published lecture:

His profound mind admitted the perilous opinion . . . that he was an abnormal person, . . . and this ecstasy connected itself with just this office of explaining the moral import of the sensible world. . . .

Whatever he saw, through some excessive determination to form in his constitution, he saw not abstractly, but in pictures, heard it in dialogues, constructed it in events. When he attempted to announce the law most sanely, he was forced to couch it in parable.

Modern psychology offers no similar example of a deranged balance. (Centenary, IV, 118-9.)

Here Emerson implied that Swedenborg's preference for expression in symbols was proof of a "deranged balance." Yet in his "Journal," August 3, 1835, he had written:

I believe I never take a step in thought when engaged in conversation without some material symbol of my proposition figuring itself incipiently at the same time. (J. III, 527.)

It appears from this that Emerson's own constitution had some "excessive determination to form," that he was an "abnormal person" subject to "ecstasy," and that his own balance must have been deranged. Indeed, modern literature offers no example of deranged reasoning comparable to Emerson's at this point. He first intimated without reason or evidence, that the writing of parables is not the most sane method of announcing the law, though in his "Journal," between July 24 and 27, 1835, he had written:

All poets, orators and philosophers have been those who could most sharply see and most happily present emblems, parables, figures. Great writing and brilliant conversation are perpetual

allegories. . . . Light and heat have passed into all speech for knowledge and love. (J. III, 509-510.)

Yet Emerson assumed, also without reason or evidence, that this preference for parable in Swedenborg's case was proof of a deranged balance. Later, to give color to this charge of deranged balance, he treated what he called the parables of Swedenborg as though they were to be taken quite literally: he did not, at any rate, attempt to interpret them otherwise. It is as if one who in private had praised Aesop as a writer of fables, should publicly call him crazy because he did write fables and then proceed to prove his derangement by the fact that in his fables he represents animals as talking, though every fool knows that animals can't talk.

I challenge the premise Emerson took for granted: namely, that preference for parable is proof of a deranged balance. On that assumption Aesop, and even the Teacher of whom it is written, "Without a parable spake he not unto them," are further examples of "deranged balance." I doubt if Emerson would have relished the necessary conclusion to which his surreptitiously injected premise inevitably leads.

Indeed, Emerson himself had written in his Journal, April 16, 1835:

Fable avoids the difficulty, it is at once exoteric and esoteric, and is clapped by both sides. Plato and Jesus used it. (J. III, 468.)

Plato and Jesus, of course, could use fable without being deranged: but if Swedenborg used it, that proved his derangement. Such is Emerson's logic. His attempt to connect Swedenborg's use of parable with his alleged insanity is a miserable failure. Only on the assumption that Swedenborg did *not* write parable can any reasonable suspicion of his sanity arise. The telling of religious truth in parable form, far from being proof of a deranged balance, is universally recognized as a sign of superior intelligence.

Emerson tried to make a causal connection between two ideas accidentally associated in his own mind, and succeeded only in writing absurdity.

The attacks on Swedenborg in the "Mystic" lecture, inconsistent as these are with Emerson's own teachings, are explicable only on the assumption that Emerson permitted popular prejudice against Swedenborg to force him into an attitude contradictory to his own spiritual intuitions and ideas, some of which, notably the doctrine of correspondence, he definitely derived from Swedenborg. In order to attack his benefactor, Emerson took positions which were quite at variance with his own spiritual doctrines. Though Emerson himself gloried in his own inconsistency, his biographers and critics for the most part have labored to conceal and minimize what they must rightly regard as his greatest weakness: his radical instability and failure to maintain a consistent attitude, a failure nowhere more marked than in his comments on Swedenborg. At his best, Emerson is not only a master of English style, but something of a teacher of spiritual truth; at his worst, he is the Emerson who wrote "Swedenborg; or, the Mystic."

CLARENCE HOTSON, PH. D.

*University of Minnesota.*

# SWEDENBORG'S DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

By Frederick M. Billings

(*Reprinted from the Methodist Review, September, 1929*)

EARLY in 1908 the writer received from a professor in a Western seminary, who had said that "the creative Word himself became a creature," the following explanation:

I had meant simply this, that the Godhead became manifested in human flesh. What was in my thought at the time I wrote this was, that in the Incarnate Son of God there was born, or incarnated, an ego different from the ordinary ego of man, his ego being nothing less than God himself. I think this probably is also your view of the matter.

Before turning to Swedenborg I will give four answers in a correspondence school examination two years ago, each of which, much to my surprise, obtained full marks, a percentage I had never reached in England or America. I begin thus, as Swedenborg wrote a hundred and fifty years ago, when words and methods of thought, both secular and sacred, were different, so that a modern setting, though imperfect, may interest the *Methodist Review*, as it covers in outline Swedenborg's position. There is no need to give the questions, as the answers will suggest them.

The passage in Isaiah xl, 3, 5, "Prepare ye the way of Jehovah, make straight in the desert a highway for our God, and all flesh shall see it together," identifies the Lord Jesus Christ with the Divine as revealed to Israel. Jesus was Jehovah "made flesh," rather than a person separate from Jehovah, for the "only begotten Son" was the son born of Mary, and however we may describe the prior manifestation, as Son, or the Word, or Jehovah, there then began "a new and living way, even his flesh," the added means of contact which had become necessary because of man's fall; it did

not come until "the fullness of time," although it had been foreseen, and the Hebrew ritual was a foretelling and prefiguring, keeping alive belief in the promised Redeemer.

---

The Divine presence called the Holy Spirit should be distinguished as a result of the Incarnation, bringing the possibility of salvation to men. The Holy Spirit was not yet ("given" is in italics) because Jesus was not yet glorified (John vii, 39). The Spirit of Jehovah, frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, had been with Adam in Eden, but by and after the fall, that contact was lessened and lost, and a temporary substitute was given, of representative and sacrificial worship, which was renewed at Sinai for Israel until the fullness of time. The fact that there was belief in those days on the Lord who would come, illustrates the need for the Incarnation, for a nearer presence of God, adapted to redemption and salvation.

---

Isaiah liii gives foreshadowing as to the work and death of Christ. One general doctrinal view concerns itself with iniquity, —"the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all"; another view turns toward punishment. Verse 11 says, "He shall bear their iniquities." In Hebrews ii, 18, we read: "He himself hath suffered, being tempted" (that is, the suffering results from the temptation); the primary fact was the definite stand or battle by the Lord against hell or the devil—the secondary or incidental, was the suffering consequent upon that—bearing our griefs, carrying our sorrows. Suffering and deaths on battlefields are incidental to victory, the living are the victors.

---

Some inadequate views of the death of Christ do not consider what it was that died, and why that death. It is the general Christian belief that Jesus had two parts, one Divine from the Father, the other human from the mother. It is not possible to think that the Divine in him died. Whatever in him that ceased or changed, that was laid down, must have been human—and not the human in him that he had glorified—but that part that he no longer needed —that had remained outside that glorious body that appeared to the three disciples when he was transfigured.

Leaving these well-rewarded answers, in order to make the transition to Swedenborg's setting less marked, I now give some supporting statements. The first two are from

P. T. Forsyth. In his book, "The Person and Place of Jesus Christ," we read, page 354:

God in Christ is the maker of his own revelation. It was God himself that came to us in Christ; it was nothing about God, even about his eternal essence or his excellent glory. It is God that is our salvation, and not the truth about God.

And on page 319:

It took the whole power of Godhead to save; it was not the Son's work alone . . . the Divine nature must belong to the univerbal and final Redeemer, however its mode and action might be conditioned by the work it had to do . . . the Divine qualities were kept, but only in the mode that salvation made necessary.

Another well known theologian may be quoted:

What we are to work with and perpetuate is the simple faith of the New Testament, that God was in Christ, and that God was manifested in the flesh . . . a Divine invasion of the world for the sake of human redemption . . . must necessarily be made through the instrumentality of a human life. (Edwin Lewis, *Methodist Review*, January, 1923.)

Just here it will be of interest to refer to Swedenborg's change of work and thought. When fifty-five years of age his life interest moved from philosophy to theology. Here follow some passages from his diaries at that time, giving hints of change, but still covering the then current beliefs to a considerable extent.

Our Lord has given me this strong faith and confidence that he helps me, for the sake of Jesus Christ, and according to his own promise. . . .

The Holy Spirit desired to lead me to Jesus, and present me to him, as a work that had been prepared by him.

About a year later, in 1745, he wrote,

Since Messiah sits at the right hand of His Father Jehovah, i. e., since all power was given him in the heavens and on the earths, he began a new creation; or, he undertook to create man anew, to plant a new paradise in a new Eden, and thus to establish anew what would otherwise have gone to ruin.

"Just an ordinary devout layman, unlearned in the theologies," our specialists may remark.

The *Arcana Cœlestia,* in Latin, was published in London from 1749 to 1756. In its first chapter, paragraph fourteen, written four years after our last quotation, we read,

> In the following work, by the name Lord is meant the Savior of the world, Jesus Christ, and him only; and he is called the Lord without the addition of other names. . . . He commanded his disciples so to call him, saying, Ye call me Lord, and ye say well, for I am (John xiii, 13). And after his resurrection his disciples called him the Lord.

With just what it was that made this change of opinion, in a man who until then had been active in science and philosophy, we have no need to deal, as our present subject is the result, not the process, of the change. Now for other quotations.

> That a Son born from eternity descended and put on the human, is refuted by the passages in the Word in which Jehovah himself says that he is the Savior and Redeemer; as, "I am Jehovah, and beside me there is no Savior" (Isa. xliii, 11); "I am thy Savior and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob" (Isa. lx, 16). (True Christian Religion, n. 82.)

There are many similar verses in the Old Testament.

The next quotation is from *Arcana Cœlestia,* n. 1999:

> The internal of the Lord, since he was conceived of Jehovah, was Jehovah himself, who cannot be divided and become another's as is the case of a son conceived of a human father; for the Divine is not like the human, divisible, but is and remains one and the same. With this internal the Lord united his human. "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself" (John v, 26). In proportion, therefore, as the Lord was conscious in the human from his mother, he appeared distinct from Jehovah, and adored Jehovah as one different from himself; but as he put off this human, he was not distinct from Jehovah, but one with him. The former state was of humiliation, the other of glorification.

The next passage is from *Arcana Cœlestia,* n. 5321:

> The very Infinite, which is above all the heavens, and above the

inmost things in man, cannot be manifested except by the Divine-Human, which exists with the Lord alone. The communication of the infinite with the finite is in no other way possible; which is the reason why Jehovah, when he appeared to men of the most ancient church, and in succeeding time, was manifested to them as a man.

The next, also from *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 6716:

It is known that the Lord was born as another man, from infancy, and grew in knowledge, intelligence and wisdom . . . thus that he made his human Divine by his own power—and this because he was conceived of Jehovah, and hence the inmost of his life was Jehovah himself. With man the inmost of life is from the father; this flows continually upon the external from the mother, endeavoring to make it like itself, even in the womb.

Our next passage, from "Divine Love and Wisdom," n. 233, is a direct affirmation of incarnation, of descent into the conditions of our life here. By the "natural degree" is meant the ways of thinking and working that are here as the beginnings of our life, necessary to the after formations in the future.

In the Lord from eternity (who is Jehovah) before the Incarnation were two degrees actually, as with the angels, but he then put on the third, or natural, degree, and thus became man, similar to a man in the world. Before the Incarnation his presence with men was mediate, through the angelic heavens; but after it, immediate from himself. "In that day the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun and that sevenfold" (Isa. xxx, 26). "The countenance of the Son of Man was as the sun shineth in his strength" (Rev. i, 16).

The Roman Catholic Church asks belief in exemption from evil heredity for Mary and for Jesus; the Protestant churches generally expect it in regard to Jesus. This is probably due to a desire to exclude the thought of anything of evil as being connected with the Lord. But Jesus is considered to have borne the weight of Divine displeasure or anger in Gethsemane and on the cross; also the punishment due to all of us, as a substitute sacrifice, the innocent for the guilty. In order to support this it is taught that though

the period of suffering was short, the balance is held true, because of the Deity of the sufferer. But this asserts that the Divine in the Lord suffered, the truth being that it was as the Son of man that his contact with evil was made, and that he suffered. Jesus had at birth a dual nature, his inner part the first beginnings of the Word made flesh. This grew in favor with God and man, and as it increased, the outer man, or nature, which was from the mother decreased, serving the while as a matrix or mold, in which the Divine purpose was carried to completion. What the Lord no longer needed from the human instrument died, and he rose, God manifest in the flesh, Alpha and Omega.

Belief in salvation may be in the convenient transfer of our debts, or our trespasses, to some one else; or as relief brought to us by a Divine Friend, able to complete his part of the work, and to aid in the comparatively small part that can be done by us individually, each for himself. There was substitution, in the sense of God yearning to relieve men from the valley of the shadow of death, or from the mountains into which they had wandered. This took place nearly two thousand years ago, and he still asks us to withstand in Gethsemanes, to watch one hour.

Another point: although the Jews tried hard to rid themselves of the presence of Jesus, what they actually did was to aid in the completion of his work. He said, "It is finished." What then was completed was his conflict with, his conquest of, all the evils in habit, the errors of thought, that had infested mankind. The battle-ground was in the Son of man, in the human from the mother, the only organism in the universe where evil could be met and conquered, by the power of God himself.

The Incarnation made this possible. Its results will tend to be more and more thorough, for increased knowledge of duty and of disorder makes the better choices possible.

One comes to a stone at the parting of the ways, and has to take one of the diverging paths. In regard to resurrec-

tion, he stood up a Divine man; keeping the contacts he had made on earth, with all the forces, good and bad, that we have to deal with; leaving nothing in the tomb but the grave clothes. "Handle me and see. A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."

He says in effect, "I am forevermore the Divine with men in their everyday life of service and of resistance to evil; a visible God, in the sense of having been known here, as to character, and as to thought as concerned with life; knowable to those who desire to know me, and who are willing to ask for what they need.

"As Creator, I am with you, for all things subsist from me; moment by moment I give power, spiritual and physical, to the worlds; which are held in place by me; men, sparrows, lilies and the waters.

"As Redeemer, I am in touch with all the phases or degrees of loss, of perversion, for I have the keys of hell and of death, have known all such things, having faced them, one by one, as the Son of man, and overcome."

Even so, come, Lord Jesus!

Frederick M. Billings.

# THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN*

By Hector Waylen

FOR many years there was an obvious gap in the series of theological works known as The International Commentary. That gap has now been filled up. Not long ago we had two volumes upon the Apocalypse, by Dr. Charles; and now we have two more volumes upon the Gospel according to St. John, written by the Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., who departed this life over two years ago, but left the manuscript of this work complete. It has now been edited by the Rev. A. H. McNeile, D.D., and forms a notable contribution to the ever-growing literature concerned with *the most precious possession of the Christian Church,* and a memorial to the piety and to the learning of the late Archbishop of Dublin.

A work of this character is naturally of great interest to the New Church. We are peculiarly concerned with the value of personal witnesses to things seen and heard; and the whole controversy which for over a century has raged around the Johannine writings testifies at least to the importance of genuine witnessing for Truth. The Lord Himself was a "witness faithful and true"; and our minds and hearts seem to demand that there shall have been witnesses of the things concerning Him who were also men faithful and true.

Beginning with the Introduction, which covers 188 pages

**A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John.* By the Most Rev. and Right Hon. J. H. Bernard, D.D.; edited by the Rev. A. H. McNeile, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1929. 2 vols., 8vo. $9.00.

and deals mainly with the views entertained by Dr. Bernard upon the authenticity question, these may be briefly summarized as follows:

(1) John, the son of Zebedee, was identical with "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and practically the whole of what we have in the Gospel is due, in substance, to him.

(2) The evidence for an early martyrdom is, on careful examination, deemed insufficent, and the traditional view that the aged Apostle died in Ephesus, towards the end of the first century, is accepted.

(3) Although it is not certain, the Apocalypse was also probably due to the Apostle John, the difference in style between it and the Gospel being accounted for on the theory that the latter, at any rate, was put into form by another hand. To have "written," in New Testament times, did not necessarily imply actual penmanship. In Rom. 15:15 Paul said he "wrote"; yet the same letter states that the actual writing was done by Tertius (Rom. 16:22).

(4) The Gospel of John was not intended to be allegory, but history; having in view, at the same time, the setting forth of the Divinity of the Lord, in all His words and actions. In writing it, a knowledge of the Synoptic tradition was assumed on the part of the reader, and many tacit corrections were made of historical inaccuracies which the Apostle perceived to have been incorporated in the Gospels previously written.

(5) The actual writing, and to some extent the composition, of the new Gospel was the work of "John the Elder," who was also the author and writer of the Johannine Epistles. The concluding chapter of the Gospel was by the same hand, and in the words "we know that his testimony is true," the Elder speaks for himself and the other Elders of the Ephesian Church, adding a final comment of his own in v. 25.

(6) The Gospel, as we have it, contains a few non-

Johannine glosses, besides the story of the adulterous woman which was no part of the original work.

Various dislocations are also assumed to have affected the original sequence, and in the Greek text now printed c. 6 precedes c. 5., and sections of c. 7 are given in a different order. As first written the document was in Greek, and Dr. Burney's theory of an Aramaic original is rejected. But the *thought* behind the text is "Aramaic," and to this many mannerisms expressed in the Greek testify. The most likely date of composition is taken as 95 A.D.

Anyone who is familiar with the questions in debate which have exercised the minds of critics for a long time past, will see from the above that Dr. Bernard has, to a great extent, surrendered the "case" for those who reject the traditional view. That there has been room for critical questions and even for honest doubts upon many things connected with the Johannine writings may be freely admitted. At the same time it cannot be denied that a desire to get away as far as possible from any reliable "witness" to certain matters recorded in the Gospel, and an effort to "account" for it in terms of Greek or Hermetic philosophy, and above all, the wish to eliminate any claim to Deity on the part of the "historical Jesus," have been underlying motives which have led the greater part of these writers to press into service every possible argument against the authenticity of "the Gospel according to John." For some time past it has become the fashion to deny that this, the chief gem in Christian literature, could be the work of the Apostle. If you held the traditional belief, you were a "back number." You might as well appear in society with old-fashioned frills and a periwig.

In reading this Commentary, the impression grows that Dr. Bernard regards the supposed "John the Elder" as little more than an amanuensis. I say "supposed," for the historical grounds for the existence of this individual are of the slenderest. Those who insist that he distinguished him-

self by the title of "*the* elder," omit to recognize that the elder men, and the instructors in the Early Church, were all so described, and that Peter uses the term of himself. In I Pet. 5:1 the Apostle speaks as a fellow-elder (*sumpresbuteros*), and it may be added that the Papyri show that to be an "elder" was a recognized function in Jewish social life long before the establishment of Christianity. The reason why the critics have been so anxious to prove the existence of a second John of Ephesus is because they want a man who knew about Jesus, and about Palestine, yet who was not John the Apostle. They have to suppose that this second John was one of an outside group of disciples, and younger than the son of Zebedee, who was the youngest of the Apostles.

But Dr. Bernard, to whom we are under obligations for a really interesting and very painstaking Commentary, is deeply impressed with the essential veracity of the Gospel. More than any other that I have read, he brings out those little incidents and minute touches which no romance-writer would ever have thought of, and which not only establish genuine "witness" to actual events, but show that the words attributed to the Lord, even if colored by the personal style of the writer, do represent what must have been the thoughts of the Lord, and that if "back to Jesus" be our quest, we must needs go back to the Gospel of John.

It is thus difficult to avoid the feeling that Dr. Bernard's position with regard to this alleged "John the Elder" is but a weak concession to the Modernist spirit. The words of Jn. 21, vv. 20-25, would indicate that John the Apostle was still living when the final Appendix was added to the Gospel, which at first terminated at 20:31. It was necessary, in view of the approaching death of the aged Apostle, to set right a notion which had got abroad in the Church that he would not die until the coming of the Lord. Hence these supplementary verses. But we may be sure that, if John was still living, he would not allow a mere scribe to write

for him anything but the truth as he knew it. If a scribe came into the business, he was a scribe, and little more. That such a scribe was employed is needed to explain v. 21:24; and the rather childish observation of v. 25 may well be his own. Perhaps he was only needed when the Appendix was added, and as the Apostle was nearing his end.

From the question of authorship we may now pass on to the Commentary, noting just a few of the many points discussed, interesting to all Christian students, or of especial interest to those of the New Church.

The Prologue with which the Gospel opens, is, says Dr. Bernard, "a hymn on the creative Logos." The words *en archē,* commonly translated "in the beginning," really go back to a First Principle in God. It is in this deeper sense that John uses the word *archē,* not only here, but in various other places; in Jn. 8:25, e.g., when the Jews pressed the Lord to say clearly what He was, and He replied *"ten archēn* as I say unto you." For the Lord was the embodiment of the Divine Wisdom.

The special use of the Gr. verb *lalein* is noticed. It is applied by John 33 times, in the first person, to the Lord Jesus, though only once used by the Synoptists. It implies, Dr. Bernard thinks, "frankness or openness of speech." Should we not rather say that it signifies Divine Inspiration?

Dr. Bernard also remarks upon the difference in use between *theorein* and *optomai,* both words being commonly rendered by the English verb *to see.* But the first is used by the writer of the Fourth Gospel of seeing on the physical plane, and the second of seeing spiritually. There is a good example of this in Jn. 16:16: "A little while, and ye will not see me (*theoreite*), and again a little while and ye shall see me" (*opsesthe*). The disciples, as Swedenborg states (True Christian Religion, n. 793), saw the Lord, after the resurrection, with the "eyes of the spirit."

Still more important is the real meaning of *trogein,* the

word usually translated "eat" in "he who eats my flesh" (Jn. 6:54), and related passages. It is a word meaning to *chew* or *feed continually,* and was always used in relation to feeding upon vegetable food. We can see at once why this word was employed. Our Lord sought to dispel utterly from the minds of the unspiritual Jews all notions of eating physical flesh. The "flesh" and "blood" which He had said they must eat if they would have "true food" were His Life and His Truth, transmitted and received into the soul.

One or two textual emendations may also be noticed. From the recently discovered Koridethi manuscript (Jn. 11:42) may be read, "for the sake of the crowd standing by me, I do it in order that they might believe," etc. Jesus, at the raising of Lazarus, did not offer prayer to the Father just that by-standers might hear what He said, as represented in our common versions; but He prayed and called forth Lazarus in His own Divine will.

Again: the statement that the soldiers filled a sponge with vinegar and "put it upon hyssop" (Jn. 19:29) has always been a bit of a puzzle. Dr. Bernard has found a manuscript with the reading *husso perithentes,* and is of opinion that *hussopo* (or hyssop) is a scribe's error for *husso,* which would mean a javelin,—the Latin *pilum,* of which each soldier carried two. Set upon a *pilum,* the sponge could be raised to the lips of the Lord, and the statement is then in harmony with Mk. 15:36, although the word there used is a "reed." But in John we have the close observer who stood near to the cross. Peter, from whom the Markan tradition was derived, was probably at a distance.

Dr. Bernard also thinks that the "cock crow" which it was predicted would follow Peter's denial was the *alektorophonia,*—the hour of cock-crow,—a signal given in the Roman army for the change of guard at the end of the third watch. "Cocks," observes the Archbishop, "are apt to crow at uncertain hours during the night: but 'before the *alektorophonia*' is precise." The use of the word *proi,*

which follows in v. 28, is in harmony with this interpretation, that being the technical term for the fourth watch. Probably all readers will not feel inclined to accept this view of the case. The variant which makes the cock crow "twice" is against such an interpretation.

It is time now to say something as to Dr. Bernard's attitude to the supernatural element in the Gospel. This is by no means an attitude of irreverant scepticism, and yet the author leans to a naturalistic explanation whenever it is possible to suggest it. He evidently believes that the "two angels" seen sitting in the sepulchre were two Essenes. The Essenes were accustomed to dress in white, and they were supposed by the distracted Mary Magdalene to be supernatural beings. Dr. Bernard is evidently so-minded because the angels are elsewhere called "men" (Lk. 24:4). But did the good Archbishop never read in the Old Testament that angels were men? That is how they are described in Gen. 32:24, or in Jud. 13:16.

Under this predilection we are not surprised to find that Dr. Bernard thinks that an actual dove or pigeon was seen, by John the Baptist, to alight upon the head of Jesus; that when the Lord was seen walking "upon (*epi*) the sea," it meant no more than *by* the lake; that when He told the disciples to cast in their net on the right side, He had just "noticed from the shore that a shoal of fish was gathering at the farther end of the boat." So also with regard to the miracle at Cana: he remarks that while the story no doubt rests upon some actual incident, "it is impossible now to discern exactly what took place," and he is evidently open to think it just possible that "the belief of the *architriklinos* that he had been drinking wine, when he had only been drinking water, may have been an illusion due to the magnetic and compelling force of the words of Jesus."

All this is rather curious in view of the fact that when we come to the miracle of the feeding of more than 5000 persons with five loaves and two fishes, Dr. Bernard appears

to accept the Gospel account of what took place. He does not support the idea here that the Lord used any kind of wholesale hypnotic suggestion; nor does he accept the "sacramental" explanation. This latter, I may explain, in case any readers should not have heard of it, is an ingenious invention of certain German critics who explain the miracle by assuming that Jesus divided the bread and fish into extremely small fragments, so that a large number of people, at any rate, were able to have a little, and thus, being filled with spiritual teaching the while, they did eat and were satisfied. Dr. Eisler and Dr. Albert Schweitzer both adopt this explanation; but it raises far more difficulties than it solves. There is also the theory that the whole story is but a piece of symbolism,—that spiritual truth and truths about hidden things were given out by Jesus and passed on to thousands by His disciples. But one thing is clear: that all four Evangelists relate it with the evident understanding that it was an actual and outward occurrence. Nor does Swedenborg, who gives an interior meaning to many things in the Old Testament of which he rejects the literal sense, ever treat it as anything else, although he gives to its details an interior signification.

It is the teaching which Dr. Bernard might have derived from the Swedish seer which would have helped him in many places where he finds difficulty. He is especially weak in dealing with the symbolism of numbers, and tries to avoid an esoteric sense whenever he can. The 153 fishes, he suggests, were just the number which the disciples counted when they divided the catch, as fishermen are wont to do. It does not seem to strike the Archbishop that, if such a thing as an Incarnation of the Divine Nature ever took place, such very small matters as the counting of a certain number of fishes could be easily effected, if it were necessary to do so in order to convey some spiritual truth.

But greater than all His works was the Lord Himself. In v. 18 of c. I, Dr. Bernard adopts the reading *monogenes,*

*theos,*—inserting commas after each word, and thus making the sense of the whole passage to be:

God hath no man seen at any time.
The Only-Begotten, who is God, who dwells in the Father's Bosom,
This is He who revealed God.

"Brought Him forth to view" as Swedenborg has been translated, would be still better in rendering the Gr. *exegesato.*

*Theos* (God), here, is without the article, and it is clear from New Testament usage that the word is therein often understood in a "catacrestic" sense, as Philo calls it. *Theos* implies the Divine Nature; but when God in the absolute sense is spoken of, we generally have *ho theos.* This distinction is not rigidly kept to, especially in the Apostolic Epistles; nevertheless it is to be found in the Gospels and more especially in the Gospel according to John.

The word *paraclētos,* which means an advocate or strengthener ("comforter" in Old English, and as used by Wycliff, meant one who *made strong* rather than *consoled*), had been adopted into Jewish speech, and is found in the Targums, so that its use in conversation attributed to Jesus and the Pharisees is no argument against verbal veracity. Dr. Bernard accepts the First Epistle of John as the work of whoever wrote the Gospel; and in 1 Jn. 2, Jesus Himself is described as our Paraclete. The various texts in which this word occurs are naturally discussed, in this Commentary, from the Trinitarian standpoint. To those who can take a more interior view of the nature of Trinity in Deity, the various utterances in the Last Discourse, will not present any very great difficulty. While the Lord was with His disciples, in the flesh, and speaking to their outward mind, He was their daily Paraclete. When He would be withdrawn to the Father they would need "another Paraclete,"—the Divine Influx, otherwise named "the Spirit of Truth." This was "from the Father," being the Divine Wisdom sent forth by the Divine Love. And inas-

much as the Humanity of the Lord would now be glorified, and a more powerful influx be possible than had been given in Old Testament times, it would also be an inflowing of the Lord Jesus, even as He had said, "I will not leave you orphans; I will come to you."

There are no textual changes in the Greek of these portions of the Gospel as adopted by Dr. Bernard which call for special comment. The Apostle would use the masculine article in connection with the Paraclete because God was always so described in Jewish religion, and the Lord Jesus had come as a man. We must recollect that Jesus spoke in Aramaic. *Pneuma* (spirit) in Greek, is neuter; but "spirit" in Aramaic is feminine. The Gospel to the Hebrews makes Jesus speak of "My Mother the Holy Spirit." It would have been impossible to write in Greek and reproduce such details in grammar without explanations which would have been quite out of place.

The use of the word *metabainein* (Jn. 13), Dr. Bernard remarks, is peculiar to "John." The word means *to go over,* and in the sense of passing over from this life to the next "its use here . . . is without Biblical parallels."

One very extraordinary suggestion by Dr. Bernard is that the *huperetai* (Jn. 18:36), rendered "servants" in the A.V., but more correctly translated by the word *officers* (they were the Temple guards sent by the Sanhedrim to arrest Jesus), were . . . angels! But this will not do at all. Pilate's whole object was to find out if Jesus was really aiming at armed rebellion against the Roman Empire. To this Jesus replied saying that had His Kingdom been "of this world," then would His guards have been fighting for His safety. Many desperate efforts have been made by commentators to avoid the conclusion that Jesus could never have sanctioned war in defence of Himself and of Justice, but this is surely the most far-fetched. If it were so, it might be pointed out that according to Swedenborg the celestial angels never defend themselves.

It has been evident to most students of the Johannine problem that, as at first written, the Gospel ended with the words, "But these are written . . . that believing ye may have life in His name" (Jn. 20:31). The Appendix, now forming the 21st chapter, was added to explain the restoration of Peter as leader in the Church, and also to correct an erroneous belief based upon certain words spoken by the Lord with regard to the life of the Apostle John, and to the promised Second Advent. The death of John would soon take place, and meanwhile the Lord had not returned in any outward way. Dr. Bernard remarks that *heos erchomai* means literally "while I am coming," although he takes it as meaning here "until I come." As a bodily and visible return was looked for by the early Christians, that was probably how the words were understood. John writes to correct the idea that his own death would be prevented by the coming of the Lord. This was necessary, for, as Dr. Bernard further observes, the saying of Jesus to the disciples on one occasion (Mk. 9) that there were some present who would not die until "the Kingdom of God came with power," must have made a profound impression. But now the hope of a speedy return was dying out. Would the last promise with regard to John also fail?

Does not even this final incident support the old view that the son of Zebedee was the author of both Gospel and Epistles? I incline to think that it does, and that the aged Apostle desired to lead his fellow Christians into more spiritual ways of thinking, not only about the Eucharist, but about the Second Advent as well. And if so, it was he who also wrote, saying, "We know moreover that the Son of God has come, and has given us insight, so that we are getting to know Him that is true, in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and life age-abiding."

Notwithstanding such shortcomings as have been noticed, one rises from the reading of this work of Dr. Bernard with a deepened sense of the value of the Fourth Gospel,

and with belief in the Divinity of our Lord reassured. One reflects, however, upon the beautiful saying of Origen, that "No one can apprehend the meaning [of the Gospel of John] unless he have lain upon the breast of Jesus, and have received also, from Jesus, Mary to be his mother." A commentary is still needed which shall combine the best results of scholarship with a deeper understanding of spiritual things than the majority of our learned men have enjoyed during recent years.

It will be almost superfluous to remark that there is no reference to Swedenborg in these two volumes. Even when writing a special chapter upon the psychology of religion in his recent Commentary upon the Bible, Dr. Gore has made no allusion to the writer of the "Arcana." Neither in science nor in theology is it yet good form to recognize Swedenborg. But his time will come.

HECTOR WAYLEN.

# EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

## THE LIFE AT THE FRYEBURG SUMMER SCHOOL.

The summer season is the time of vacations. People are glad to escape the heat and toil of the city for recreation and refreshment in the mountains or at the sea-side. The mountains and lakes of Maine attract thousands during the months of July and August. The beautiful scenery, the invigorating mountain air, mountain climbing and boating, give variety of enjoyment and exercise, which restore the energies and prepare for the work of the business season to follow. Fryeburg is well situated for these advantages and opportunities. An attractive village nestled in the valley of the Saco, with the mountains in full view, and numerous lakes nearby, it is an almost ideal spot for summer visitors to congregate.

It was a happy thought on the part of some Maine New-Churchmen to take advantage of the opportunities afforded, and to have a summer school at Fryeburg. Accordingly, about nine years ago the Rev. Louis A. Dole, with the hearty co-operation of others, made a beginning. Year by year the attendance and interest have increased until this year there were over one hundred present. At the session last year, the prospect was so encouraging, and the importance of the situation was so fully realized, that plans were set on foot to buy a piece of land, admirably suited to the purposes of the school, and to build on it. The response was generous, the land was bought, and one unit of the buildings was ready for use when the Assembly met this year. Enthusiasm for going ahead with the work was spontaneous and contagious; and concentrated efforts will be made to add other buildings for use next year.

It is the purpose and effort of the school to combine instruc-

tion and recreation. Religious services are held morning and evening for the three Sundays of the session, and every morning religious services begin the day's work. The forenoon is given to lectures, which are discussed freely in open meeting. The afternoon and evening are given to recreation and amusement,—excursions, dramatics, music, dancing, with occasional lectures. All take their meals together, and collect before and after meals for conversation. This gives a sociable feature, which is very desirable and greatly enjoyed. In the spirit of free discussion, the Question Box was added to the program, and it shared with the lectures the period of the morning hours. Questions were handed to the leader in writing; he read them aloud to the Assembly, and received the answers. Every one was free both to ask and to answer questions. As a result there was a spontaneous expression of opinion, and a general participation in the discussion of the answers given. This suggests one of the signal benefits of the summer school. It is a sort of clearing house for the various ideas and opinions of the members of the Church at large. In this way both the school and the Church get the benefit of mutual instruction and enlightenment. Accordingly, there has been a perceptible growth of the feeling that the Fryeburg summer school is becoming one of the important institutions of the Church, both educational and social. The opportunity for people of various quarters of the Church to get well acquainted with each other, and to exchange habitual views and sentiments, is of itself a valuable means of enlarging and liberating, as well as clarifying, thought and interests. The lectures, too, are capable of being developed into more and more systematic instruction in new and advanced fields of thought and effort. Moreover, the school is a fair sample of the Church at large, and of the community in which the Church is placed. Through various channels the forces of the world act upon New-Church people, as upon other members of the community. The views, opinions, currents of thought, the sentiments and interests, and the principles of thought and conduct, of the body of mankind,

constitute an omnipresent and pervasive atmosphere, in which we all live, move, and have our being. We carry around, each of us, his own appropriated section of this atmosphere; and when we meet, these sections combine in various ways. The result is modification and enlargement, and we become more and more socialized. To preserve our New-Church identity under these circumstances, it is necessary to be progressively instructed and firmly established in our principles; otherwise we shall be swept along in the currents of the atmosphere about us. There was abundant evidence, in private conversation and in public discussion, of the influence of these worldly currents, and of the interaction between them and the New-Church principles which were called into use. This situation stimulated observations and reflections which may enhance interest in the life at the Fryeburg summer school, and throw further light on its importance.

The lectures were planned to cover the general subject of the Bible. This naturally and properly led to the Church, to marriage, to science, to recent books, and to some special subjects. The discussions had a wide range, and revealed directly and indirectly underlying currents of thought and principles of the present age. Some of these currents are so powerful that they may work disastrous consequences, unless we are prepared to meet them with an adequate knowledge of their nature and influence. Religion is at the present time engaged in what seems to many a death struggle with the forces of naturalism,—a term which Swedenborg defines as the philosophy that deduces all things from nature, and which he constantly and consistently treats as the deadly foe of religion and of spiritual life. The natural sciences and natural history have in recent years made such amazing progress, and the agencies for disseminating information and for propagating views and opinions are so abundant and effective, that the public mind has become imbued with the principles and methods of a naturalistic and rationalistic philosophy to such an extent as to be virtually helpless. Under the spell and blinding influence of

naturalism, many of the religious leaders of the day have abandoned—in thought, if not in language—traditional Christianity, and are seeking some form of universalistic humanism. With them even the words "religion," "God," and "spiritual," have a transformed meaning; so that we are constantly in danger of being misled by their use of these words. The word "religion," for example, means in the new vocabulary a certain attitude toward the universe, or toward reality in general; or it means a life which the the individual chooses to call good, —identical in some cases with what Swedenborg calls a good natural life merely. The word "God," too, changes its meaning from a personal Creator and Heavenly Father to a universal influence, or force, or "administration," or else to some special feature of the natural universe. The word "spiritual" acquires a meaning which varies from a violent state of egotistic effervescence to commonplace self-assertion. New-Churchmen ought to be on their guard against such misleading use of familiar words, and should avoid reading their own New-Church ideas into the language of popular orators and writers. Words have a context, historical and logical, sentimental and intellectual, which varies with the speaker or writer; and every one has a right to be understood in the light of his own context, rather than in the context of the hearer or reader. Many religious words have an entirely different context for New-Churchmen from that of minds surcharged with the naturalism of the day; and, to avoid confusion and misunderstanding, it is important for us to recognize this.

There are certain words and phrases which are typical of the naturalistic and individualistic radicalism of the day; and some of these cropped out in the discussions at the summer school. It may be that those who used them were not aware of the historical and logical context; but their occurrence was an illustration of how the philosophy of a period finds expression in the everyday vocabulary. We heard, for example, such expressions as

'I am not concerned about the future life; I am interested in the present.'

'I accept no authority but my own experience; I judge for myself.'

'We have to solve our own problems on the basis of our own experience.'

'We turn our backs on tradition, and experiment for ourselves; and we find out for ourselves what is good and what not.'

'We do not accept conventional moral standards; we are going to establish our own moral standards.'

If those who use these expressions so confidently were informed as to their historical context, they would use them more cautiously and critically. Much of modern radicalism has its roots in the remote past. So the current denunciation of religion is little more than a repetition of Lucretius and an interpretation of life from the point of view of Epicurean naturalism. So, too, the present-day treatment of the Bible is in general a repetition of the language of Spinoza. The individualistic philosophy of our day goes back to the reactionary impulses of the Renaissance, and was carried to extremes by the Romanticists. J. J. Rousseau is the father of much of present-day humanism—Rousseau, a typical humanist, who abandoned his own children, and wrote an elaborate essay on the care and education of children. The historical and logical context of expressions like the above is prevailingly anti-religious, not merely in the conventional sense, but in the sense of a philosophy of human life.

The characteristic of modern naturalism and individualism is, that they are based on the elaborate rationalism of the principles and methods of modern science. These principles and methods are being applied to the study of religion and human life. There is no valid objection to such application within proper limits. But a conspicuous and disastrous result is, that religion has been universalized, and thus detached from any special relation between God and man, and made to be a

character of man's attitude towards the universe in general, or towards what seems to him to be reality, or an attitude towards some special feature or features of the universe. At this stage the specific character of religion as the relation between man and God disappears, and what is left is merely an experience of nature.

On the other hand, when the principles and methods of science are applied to the study of human life apart from religion, the result is more plausible, but equally, though more subtly, disastrous. Man is then assumed to be merely a part of nature. He not only loses the supernatural and religious elements of his constitution, but he becomes a self-sufficient product of nature, an independent, self-determining being,—a being capable of directing his own course, of creating his own ideals and ends, and of achieving unaided his own destiny. This result is flattering to one's conceit, and accords with appearances. It lies at the foundation of our radical individualism, and has its fruit in the egotistic humanism of Rousseau and Nietzsche. This philosophical egotism is the legitimate and consistent outcome of naturalism. And although it has infected our religion, our literature, and popular thought, it is really a shallow philosophy.

A serious study of history, and a deeper analysis of human experience, points in a different direction. It is in many ways obvious that man is a dependent creature. He is dependent on nature for food and drink, and for the air he breathes, for the stimulus of his sense activities, and for the objects of his practical interests, for the earth to walk on, and for the beauties of land and sky. He is still more intimately dependent on his fellowmen,—on his parents, his family circle, the circle of his friends and acquaintances, and the larger community. He is dependent upon these sources for impressions, impulses, feelings, ideas, sentiments, emotions, principles, and motives; these come from history, tradition, books, newspapers, magazines, the movies, the theatre, the radio, etc. Apart from the influences of this social environment, man would be below the

level of a savage. Some have thought that he would be the primitive man. But there is no reason to suppose that there has ever been such a man; such a man is really inconceivable. Even a man's self-consciousness is, as Royce so brilliantly argued, dependent very largely on social contact. In view of this dependence, the egotistic language of the day sounds shockingly vain.

But there is a still deeper ground for asserting man's dependence, and that is found in the philosophy of love. A systematic analysis of the nature of love leads us to the conclusion that life is love, and love is life; and this is another way of saying that man is love, and love on the level of rationality and freedom is man. But the love which man is, depends upon a love which is inclusive of his love, and finally upon a love which is all-inclusive, the love of the universe. All-inclusive, infinite love is God. It is this Love that creates the world, and man as one item of the world. Accordingly man is not an original product of nature; he is a created being, and as such is dependent upon his Creator. As a created form of love, he is a recipient of the creative Love; and this character of being a recipient, is his essential character. This philosophy of love is the precise opposite of naturalism. Naturalism like materialism is a truncated philosophy; it leaves out what is highest and best in life and in the universe. The philosophy of love rests on observation of a higher and deeper type than the observation that leads to naturalism. The philosophy of love comprehends spirit as well as nature; it begins with God and proceeds to nature. But for naturalism, God and the spiritual world do not exist. As La Place expressed it, the system of nature has no need of the hypothesis of God.

This analysis of humanism—humanism in the philosophical and individualistic sense—points to its fundamental weakness, and defines the point of view from which we may criticize its source and its extravagances. The doctrine that man is essentially good, and that he is self-sufficient and independent, is a perversion of the feeling of being himself, the feeling that his

life is his own. Without this feeling man would not be at home with himself; the joy of life would be empty, and his sense of being a free agent would be lacking; in other words, he would not be a man. But to have the feeling, and to take the feeling as the real truth about his essential nature, are two different things,—immensely and antipodally different things. The feeling of being one's self is God-given; but to take the feeling as the real truth, is a denial of God's existence. The human race has been infected with this denial throughout its history; and the infection now is more widespread, more pervasive, and more deadly than ever before; it has spread to all classes,—religious, non-religious, and anti-religious. It is not by accident that we have atheistic societies amongst us; it is the outcome of this humanistic philosophy consistently adhered to. But to take this feeling of being one's self as God-given, and as given for the purpose of making man to be a free and rational agent, is to acknowledge God, and to acknowledge our dependence upon Him. This feeling is what our doctrines term man's *proprium,* his ownhood, his self-hood; it is what makes a man to be a *self,* but a self to be purified and kept pure by knowing and acknowledging it to be God-given, and to be used for His sake in the service of men.

The world and the Church are at present exceedingly distressed in thought and in conduct by the philosophy which asserts man's self-sufficiency and independence. We should, of course, be self-sufficient and independent in a moderate degree with respect to each other, but not with respect to God. We should judge for ourselves, but not with the delusion that we create the light by which we see and judge. Whether we recognize it or not, we should ever be mindful that inevitably we see and judge in the light of history and of our present-day environment. We should not be bound by traditions or by the customs and fashions of the day; but we cannot abandon traditions under the delusive fancy that we may be independent of them, when the fact is that we are simply choosing what traditions we shall be bound by, and substituting one tradition

for another,—very often a tried and rejected one for one that has been tested by experience and well established. We are courting disaster when we substitute our fancies for facts, and act from impulse rather than from principle. We are told that experience is the best teacher; but the brilliant and witty Alcibiades in Plato's "Symposium" said, "Don't be a fool and learn by experience." This implies that we should learn by precept and example. In other words, it is no doubt true that experience, understood as the enlightened experience of mankind, is a needed teacher; it is unutterably and disastrously foolish to take one's own unlightened experience as the best and only teacher. To experiment with morals without moral training, discipline, and instruction, is inviting moral death. Moral death is the result of blind self-indulgence; and self-indulgence, when fortified by radical humanistic and individualistic philosophy, becomes a habit and a principle, leading to the destruction of all that is worthwhile in human life. The exhortation to self-expression imposes no limits on self-indulgence, and rests on the principle that man is essentially good. Worthy self-expression must look to a higher self which gives to the human self its only real and true excellence.

We see all around us the effects of this confirmed self-indulgence. Political corruption; industrial exploitation,—exploitation of men and material; the low level of morality, public and private, in literature and in life, and especially in the perversion of the marriage relation; are all the inevitable results of self-expression fortified by perverted principles. The state of marriage is the deepest and truest test of a personal life and of a stage of civilization. Not only this; it is the test of the quality of the religion and the spiritual life of the individuals and of the age. Glance at our literature and the records of our divorce courts, and see how we stand the test.

The Christian religion, and especially our New-Church doctrine, teaches and enjoins that marriage is a holy estate. Accordingly it has been in all Christian communities a religious as well as a civil, social, and domestic institution; not a mere

personal union for personal convenience and satisfaction. Our doctrines teach that marriage has its origin in the union of the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom in the Lord. In the creation of man this union is expressed and preserved in the union of husband and wife. Marriage is therefore a Divinely ordained, spiritual, and eternal union, which gathers into itself all the motives, powers, and blessedness of human life. It is fundamental among human relationships; it is the basis and support of orderly human interrelations, individual and social. Marriage love produces families; families produce society; society produces the state. The enlightened experience of mankind testifies that marriage is indispensable to the welfare and happiness of men and society. And yet marriage is facing at the present time serious obstacles. Some modern conditions and philosophies threaten marriage with extinction. The increasing severity of the struggle for existence, the crowding of men and women as economic units into cities and workshops, life in apartment houses as well as in hovels, the demand for the conveniences of modern life and for social position,—all these are conditions which offer formidable obstacles to marriage, especially to early marriage. But these conditions are comparatively superficial. There is developing under these conditions a state of mind, an attitude, which is destroying the human capacity for marriage,—what Swedenborg calls the marriage principle, the *conjugium*. The demands of self-indulgence combined with a philosophy of self-expression are reducing the idea and the ideal of marriage to that of a temporary union for personal convenience and for personal satisfaction. When these demands are not met, there is a growing disposition to dissolve the union at pleasure. Under the demand for self-indulgence, various substitutes for marrige are sought and practiced; trial marriage, companionate marriage, "free love" marriage, indulgence without any form of marriage, are all advocated, defended, and practiced on the principle of an egoistic philosophy, which is a part of the naturalistic and rationalistic philosophy of the day. So long as religion as the

mainspring of everyday life is infected with these philosophies, people are helpless. What is needed in marriage is the philosophy of unselfish love, the philosophy that inspires mutual devotion, the devotion of each to the happiness of the other. This philosophy is embodied in the marriage vows; and if these vows to seek each the happiness of the other above all things were kept inviolate, there would be few disasters.

Men need a body of objective truth in the form of words, ideas, ideals, verbal statements, systems of doctrine, and a belief in God as the Source of revealed truth. The New Church has the words, the ideas, the ideals, the verbal statements, the system of doctrines, and the faith, which guide to a truly moral and religious life. It has a doctrine of God and of man which protects men from egotism. The doctrine that God is Divine Love and that man is a recipient of love is a doctrine that may be learned, understood, and applied, and so verified in experience. This doctrine will free men from bondage to naturalism and rationalism, the philosophy based upon the assumption that nature is all that there is, and that reason is man's supreme guide.

We need a deeper philosophy, a philosophy that goes deeper into human experience, deeper into history, and deeper into the universe. The deepest thing in human experience and in the universe is love. A complete philosophy of love is needed to satisfy the demands of human life and to correct the one-sided philosophy of traditional history.

LEWIS F. HITE.

---

## WORD, DOCTRINE AND DISCRIMINATION

There was a time when every good Christian was supposed to find one passage of Scripture as valuable for the guidance of his thought and life as another passage. All the Bible was equally the Word of God; and this was taken to mean that any part was on a par with any other,—ceremonial directions in *Leviticus* as useful apparently as the vital utterances of religious experience in the *Psalms*, or words of Moses on a footing with

the words of the Master. The theory seems to have been adhered to abstractly, for obvious facts were against it. The Lord, and the Fourth Evangelist, and Paul, all had expressed themselves, indeed, to the contrary. To all of them the general progress of revelation at least was obvious. Divers manners of revelation were also pointed out in Scripture. Still the theory prevailed, and was often supported by a Scripture which was read as though it ran: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (2 *Timothy* iii, 16).

Had Swedenborg been an influential figure in the Christian Church of his day, or an acknowledged leader in his own church in Sweden, several statements of his and his whole point of view on Scripture would have been a bombshell to these settled but unconsidered views. He said that there are many things in Scripture or in the sense of the letter of the Word which cannot serve for doctrine (Apocalypse Explained, n.356). Indeed, he says, the Word is "closed up" to the man who takes everything in Scripture for doctrine (Arcana Cœlestia, n.3769). He proposed a generally applicable discrimination between passages in Scripture which put truth as this looked to low moral or otherwise inadequate insight, and passages which put the truth on levels of insight possible now. The former passages he called "apparent truth" and the latter "genuine truth". He even distinguished in the legislation which enjoyed the thunderous sanction of Sinai among laws which have no force today, others that are optional, and still others which obtain today (Arcana Cœlestia, n.9349).

In other words, he read and used the Scriptures with discrimination among their contents. From much Scripture he expected to draw no doctrine for thought and life today. He found details of narrative and masses of legislation unavailable for instruction in righteousness or for doctrine. In all this the world of Bible study has since joined him for adequate reasons of its own. His statements and outlook would be no bombshell now. But he pressed the point of making such discriminations. He went on to urge that the then prevailing

attitude to Scripture was spiritually disastrous. It closed the Word up. If Old and New Testament seemed on a par, of course there was no rising insight into the Word. The onward march of revelation was undone. At a time when the exercise of our own discrimination on the Scripture's utterances was deemed irreverent, he said that the lack of discrimination stultified what God most desired to make plain, and that a discriminating reading and study was the way of enlightenment.

New-Churchmen were extricated at once from this attitude to Scripture, of course. But there is always the tendency to seek an objective something by which we can indiscriminately guide ourselves without further thought. It is not clear that we do not tend to demand sometimes towards the Theological Works much the same attitude which we grant is unenlightening when taken towards the Scriptures. A statement of Swedenborg's on a characteristic of the Hebrew language threatens to get the same standing with us at times as a formulation of some truth of the spiritual life; or a comment, more or less by the way, on the date of a Bible book seems to call for defence as though a principle of the Christian life were at stake. Yet statements on such matters cannot be doctrine, still less revealed doctrine. So we have what seems in the nature of things an impossible controversy whether in the Theological Works we have a doctrine on how the ecclesiastical body shall be organized. Distinctions of value in contents may be pointed out and stood upon, not only for their own sakes, but above all to insure an enlightening approach to the teachings of the Church. Why, if it closes up the Word, should not the expectation of doctrine in every statement also close up the force and meaning of the Theological Works?

William F. Wunsch.

# BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

## HOW DID SWEDENBORG ARRIVE AT THE SPIRITUAL SENSE? (II.)

(*Concluded*)

Before we start on our investigation of Swedenborg's method, we shall, for the sake of unhampered progress and for the sake of clearness of idea and promptness of insight, set down a few of the fundamental ideas with which we have to do in the following considerations.

A few persons have striven to paraphrase the standard term in Swedenborg's works, "Spiritual Sense". To adopt one of its current definitions would be an act of appreciation of the well-meaning labor of companion toilers in the "vineyards of the Lord". But this paper makes the attempt to stand on its own feet, and consequently a re-interpretation of the universal "Spiritual Sense" is desired. Before I venture this, however, I must clarify also our idea of the "Word of God," of which this spiritual sense is the soul, as the "literal sense" is the body.

What shall we expect of a "Word of God"? What kind of a thing must it be to fulfil our expectations? The Word of God should be the method and the means of furnishing us with the right idea of God. It should inform us of the nature and constitution of God. It should have an ethical message; it should proclaim a certain conduct as the right and progressive one, and condemn its opposite. It should have a social content; it should inspire man to solve the problems of human relationship for individuals and groups in the light of its moral meaning. It should, moreover, have a philosophical scaffold, to give to its thoughts a firm support. In short, the Word of God can be defined as the "body of truth, flowing forth from God, expressed in terms of human experience".

These demands, it seems to me, one finds met in the Scriptures. There, one finds the great characteristics as outlined above. The Word of God is presented in the Scriptures. The Scriptures are for the Word the medium of approach to men. The Word of God is within them, fills them, makes them luminant.

But when we have said this, we should not stop. For when reading the Holy Scriptures we encounter various adventures. We pass through fertile valleys, and we climb high hills. We wander through waste land, and cross lovely lakes. We dwell in cities, and go to war; we are thrown into the claws of deep sorrow, and jubilant worship lifts us up. We also run into archaic formulas, into dry genealogies, into mystical rhapsodies that are remote from our experience. Although the language is in many places superb, in most places interesting, and in not a few instances thrilling or of great sweetness, it sometimes seems that its phraseology is far off, that its concepts are crude and primitive. Things happen that do not happen any longer, and that have very little historical value. People act in a way that is foreign to our behavior, and morals are praised that would shock any sensitive atheist.

This would not be a reason for men to suspect a deeper sense in Scriptures. But sensitive mind can hear voices calling within the words that are unheard by the crude ear. One must needs have a special sensitiveness, no doubt. But as some persons have a certain capacity to "feel" certain meterological disturbances that do not bother others, or other persons are very sensitive to the delicate odor of a flower that another nose does not detect, so I believe it is possible that some have a great alertness to the voice that sounds from within the Scriptures. Swedenborg had this alertness. It was not only God-given, but it was also trained and supplied with tools to detect the finer waves that break on the shore of the physical world.

I am going to speak of these tools very soon. At present I wish to define this inner voice of Scriptures in terms that are familiar to the student of religious experience; for the voices that come from beyond are the messengers of religious ex-

perience. They speak to the interior man. They speak to his *psyche*. They are psychic.

In the second section of the "Doctrine of the Holy Scripture" Swedenborg's attempt to define what the spiritual sense is, ends in a negative statement. He says what the spiritual sense is not. And in the following numbers his whole theory of the structure of the Divine and of the heavens is employed to make clear what he means by the spiritual sense. We have it presented to us in a scheme of the universe which is reflected in Scripture. We have his philosophy of causality and degrees put before us. Anyone wishing, therefore, to present the theory of the spiritual sense in the structure of Swedenborg's philosophy and universal cosmology, may very well repeat the statements found there. But I wish to present the spiritual sense in the scheme of religious experience. My terms will be those of the psychology of religious experience.

May I therefore be permitted to state my definition: *The spiritual sense of Scripture is the message of spiritual growth or decay, either of the individual or of the race, in terms of mental activities.* The history of a nation from its birth to its dispersion serves this purpose in the literal sense.

In its theological aspect the spiritual sense carries two large themes: glorification and regeneration. As a whole it speaks of the spiritual life which develops successfully in individuals and in the race, or of its degeneration. Its terminology is partly metaphysical and partly that of religious experience, thus psychological.

That sense is the spirit that gives life to the letter. (True Christian Religion, n. 192.)

The spiritual sense is the mind of Scripture, as the literal sense is the physical substructure. In other words, the spiritual sense is the psychic sense of Scripture.

The natural sense of the Word is such as it is in the sense of the letter, every particular of which becomes spiritual and afterwards celestial in the heavens; and when it becomes spiritual, it then lives in heaven from the light of truth therein; and when it becomes celestial, it lives from the flame of good therein. (De Verbo, n. 2.)

The spiritual sense of Scripture, having first been suggested to Swedenborg through his interest in correspondences, became a reality when his sight into the other world was opened. Then it became "living"; it became "spirit". Under these circumstances we must read his statements of the spiritual sense in connection with our knowledge of the other world. Indeed we may be able to rally useful support from our knowledge of the heavenly life, its nature and structure, for a more complete understanding of it.

But the thoughts of the angels of the middle heaven are all without space, time, or what is personal and material, for which reason they are unlimited and unbounded; the objects of their thoughts are spiritual, like thoughts themselves, for which reason they think concerning those objects spiritually and not naturally.

But with regard to the angels of the highest heavens, they have no thoughts, but perceptions of the things they hear and see. Instead of thoughts, they have affections, which with them are varied in like manner as thoughts are varied with the spiritual angels. (De Verbo, n. 8.)

Swedenborg states his case in negative terms. The mind of the other world is unlike the mind of this world. It is without the phenomena of the physical senses, i.e., space and time, and it is also bare of egotistic and earthbound properties (at least in its better developments, i.e., heaven). The terms of the spiritual sense will thus be non-physical, non-temporal; but when they treat of psychic phenomena of religion,—repentance, regeneration, devotion, acknowledgment of the Lord, etc.,—they will be non-egotistic, non-appropriating, when picturing the world of unselfish love, and selfish and non-participating, when picturing the world of hate and lies, i.e., hell. They will be terms of thought and affection, of the brain and the heart of men. The spiritual sense of Scripture will speak of plans, intellectual systems, of concepts, logical sequences, of analytic processes, of arguments, of reflections, of percipient capacity. It will also speak of the world of affections, of passion, feeling, sympathy, zeal, warmth, enthusiasm, cordial moods, heartiness. All these many psychic elements are packed in the two words

of Swedenborg, "thought" and "affection". Thus the spiritual sense will be speaking of thought and affection.

Still another characteristic of the spiritual sense I wish to bring to your attention; that is, its difference from anything man is familiar with. In view of this, one is almost hesitant to venture into a penetration of it. But the apparent inaccessibility stimulates the human mind to try an approach to this spiritual sense, even if it be only touched. Our incapability is vividly sketched by this experience of Swedenborg:

> I have often been sent among the spiritual angels, and I then spoke with them spiritually; and then retaining in my memory what I had spoken, when I returned into my natural state, in which is every man in this world, I then wished to bring it forth from the former memory and describe it, but I could not, *it was impossible*. There were no expressions, nor even ideas of thought, by which I could express it; they were spiritual ideas of thought and spiritual expressions, so remote from natural ideas of thought and natural expressions that I did not approximate in the least. What is wonderful, when I was in that heaven and conversing with the angels, then I knew no otherwise than that I spake in like manner as I speak with men; but afterwards I found that the thoughts and the discourses were so unlike, that they could not be approximated, consequently that there is no ratio between them. (De Verbo, n. 4.)

Shall we draw the conclusion, then, that the angelic sense of Scripture is a closed book to men? Shall we give up any attempt to penetrate it? Or does this passage only paint in strong colors the greater possibilities that lie behind our earthly capacities? I am inclined to think the latter. For Swedenborg says warningly, though promisingly:

> He thinks falsely who says with himself, "I know many correspondences; I know the true doctrine of the Divine Word; the spiritual sense will teach it to me." This cannot be done. But as has been said, let him say to himself: I know the doctrine of Divine truth; now I can see the spiritual sense, provided I know correspondences. But still I must have enlightenment from the Lord, because the spiritual sense is Divine truth itself in its light, and is meant by 'glory', and the sense of the letter by 'cloud,' in the passages in the Word where these are mentioned." (De Verbo, n. 58.)

The conditions of arriving at the spiritual sense seem to

consist of these three requirements: first, one must have a doctrine of Divine truth, or the Word; second, one must have a knowledge of correspondences; and third, these not being enough, one must have a special endowment, namely, enlightenment from the Lord. The first requirement is easily identified. It is the basic material for the ascertaining of the spiritual sense, the Word of God. From the Word, the doctrine of Divine truth is drawn. Secondly, one needs tools to erect from the material presented, the superstructure; these are the knowledges of "correspondences". Finally, there is need of a wealth of experience such as was present with Swedenborg; his other-world life. To-day we can no more draw from this last; and as it seems an equally important element in the ascertaining of the spiritual sense, we are in that respect in relative obscurity.

We have seen that Swedenborg fulfilled all three requirements. He perfected his tools in course of his scientific career to such a degree that he could, at the end of it, go ahead furtively but with great promise in the task to arrive at the spiritual sense. At that time he made himself thoroughly at home with the material, namely, the Holy Scriptures. His *Adversaria* and *Index Biblicus* certainly are monuments of his unending zeal and labor in this direction. And finally the enlightenment came from the Lord.

We know from the records of his other-world life that his experiences were real and substantial; that his presence in the other world was this enlightenment of which he speaks. We have his testimony, that he received "from the Lord alone while I have read the Word anything pertaining to the doctrine of that church".

> In order that the Lord might be continually present, he has unfolded to me the spiritual sense of his Word, wherein is Divine truth in its light, and in which He is continually present. (True Christian Religion, nn. 779, 780.)

Here we have the nutshell solution of our problem, How did Swedenborg arrive at the spiritual sense of Scripture? The answer is threefold:

1. He went to the Word and drew the doctrine;
2. He applied the apparatus of correspondences;
3. He received constant enlightenment from the Lord.

One aspect of method, which meant a failure in Swedenborg's endeavor after the deeper meaning of things, I wish now to discuss briefly; that is, the failure to come to an establishment of the "Universal Mathesis or a Mathematical Philosophy of Universals".

In the words of Wolff quoted by Swedenborg from Ontology:

> "Among the desiderata of learning is a science which should deliver the general principles of the knowledge of finite things . . . and this science would have a better title to the name of universal mathematics . . . thus we might at least obtain the true mathematical principles of natural pholosophy and psychology which might be of use to the philosophers in guiding their further discoveries . . ." It was for this end I was disposed here, as a preparatory step, to offer the doctrine of series and degrees. (Economy of the Animal Kingdom, n. 650.)

There is an echo of this in the later work on "Rational Psychology", n. 567:

> Thus indeed is it possible to submit ideas of the mind to calculation, whence arises the universal mathesis.

And once more and for the last time in "A Hieroglyphic Key" (Ex. VI:25):

> From the several examples that have been adduced, a certain analogy may be formed, and from the analogies an equation, which may be again reduced to its analogies in the following: As the world stands in respect to man, so stand natural effects in respect to rational actions, and so likewise in other examples.
>
> And if the world be donated by W, man by M, effects by E, and action by A, they may be joined together in the form of an analysis; to wit, W:M=E:A . . . first rudiments of an universal mathesis.

In this passage for the last time Swedenborg proposes this penetration of the psychological world with the help of mathematical and geometrical relations. The trend of his times was certainly this way; and Swedenborg took the suggestion of Locke and Wolff and mingled it with his own ideas, to build this universal mathesis. In the end it was a failure; and never

again does it appear in his pages. We can also dismiss it with a light heart, following the example of genius, for whom not the method, but the message, is the essential thing. Without commotion Swedenborg drops an insufficient method, which leaves not even an humble gravestone anywhere in the "Arcana," the "Apocalypse Explained" or the "Apocalypse Revealed."

One thing, however, he rescues from this period of thought; and this is, the concept of the doctrine of order, and the science of universals.

> For these sciences are but subsidiary, serving only, by a compendious method and mathematical certainty, to lead us by continued abstractions and elevations of thought from the posterior to the prior sphere; or from the world of effects which is visible, to the world of causes and principles, which is invisible. (Economy of the Animal Kingdom, II: n. 213.)

The method which Swedenborg had in mind shows, consequently, two great characteristics that never left it: compactness and definiteness. Very fortunately Swedenborg caught sight of these two necessary requirements, that give the method a standing in rational quarters. In this respect Swedenborg's method contrasts with any and every allegorical or parabolical interpretation of Scripture. For at the very beginning we note the principle of definiteness and compactness.

In the same quotations we notice in addition the generals of his method; namely, *"continued abstractions and elevations of thought"*. These are, however, not the only details of his method, which as we shall see later exhibits still other characteristics. But I venture to say that abstraction and elevation of thought are the two principal processes that typify the approach of Swedenborg.

> [From the lower and general states] the things that are in contact with the internal sensory can be raised to higher powers or elevated to higher degrees by their proper rules; and so changes of state still more universal exist which contain together and successively infinitely more particulars corresponding to the truths themselves perceived by the soul from the change of state. (Rational Psychology, n. 567.)

To discover the proper rules we must turn now to a small treatise which Swedenborg had promised in the last paragraph of the "Rational Psychology":

"Key of Natural and Spiritual Mysteries by the Way of Correspondences and Representations" which more directly and certainly leads us into hidden truths.

As nothing else, this little treatise is full of suggestive ideas which later become prominent in the large works of the "Arcana" and the "Apocalypse Revealed" and "Apocalypse Explained"; so that I wish to tarry a little longer, as the size of the treatise warrants. As it appears to me, here we have the *"key"* to the "how" of our problem, and with it the first coherent exposition of the subject.

But before we enter, let us define the most frequent term in Swedenborg's consideration: correspondence.

Correspondence is a relationship between two degrees. It is a connection. It is also a conjunction. As such it exhibits three features: causality; expression; evaluation. Correspondence is the philosophical substructure of our method; it is not the method itself.

Swedenborg's method consists of five main phases. Its materials are terms. These terms are operated with; they are classified, selected, identified, elaborated, harmonized, substituted.

The classification of the terms is carried out by Swedenborg very broadly in the great groups:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Physical; | Natural; | Likeness; |
| Mental; | Animal-rational-moral; | Types; |
| Spiritual-theological; | Theological; | Exemplars. |

With this classification in mind, we begin to work. We select terms for each group, and identify them as belonging to a specific group. We elaborate on them, whereby we test them as to their exact validity, and ascertain their position. We make sure that some of our terms are more elevated and abstracted than others, and order them in this respect into the three great groups. After this preparatory process we harmonize them;

that is, we put them in the proper relation. In this position they will sometimes show a certain discrepancy which might force us to substitute for one or several of them others that are better suited for this particular situation. Herewith we have established rigidly and under severe control a relationship.

Swedenborg's method thus proves to be strict, reliable, scientific. The material, however, is psychic material; i.e., words instead of matter.

The selection of terms for the re-presentation of one concept on different levels of eminence and universality, and for the re-signification,—or in other words for the establishing of a corresponding sense,—has to be made from the point of view that we have discussed in the preliminary considerations.

There we found that we rise from one degree to another by elevating the thought from the sphere of the particular to the sphere of the universal, and from the common to the eminent; or in terms of the metaphysician, from little detailed content to more detailed, and from inferior inner order to superior inner order. When we follow this requirement in selecting the terms for the spiritual sense, we follow Swedenborg's method.

Example IV of the "Hieroglyphic Key" will serve to typify Swedenborg's procedure. The classification of terms we sketched, is in our mind. The three categories are the natural heads under which we classify the terms we are going to relate to each other; the physical, the mental, and the spiritual, govern this classification.

Swedenborg now takes a term of the physical group: *"conatus."* "Within all *conatus* there is direction and celerity". We have selected this term as belonging to the group "physical"; and we have no difficulty to identify the term as one of the group. However, to make sure, we elaborate somewhat on the term:

> To direction which pertains to nature [direction has been found to be the most prominent feature of *conatus*] correspond both intention and determination which pertain to the rational mind. For nature is dead, and therefore cannot have intention from any voluntary principle; but still it can be directed in that it is directed.

We step up to the next order, the mental order:

Within all will ["will" has been selected as the most probable match] there is intention and determination of action in respect to degrees and moments.

Intention is the choice of Swedenborg. It is identified with will. The elaboration on the term again makes for better grounding of the first choice:

That within all will there is intention is apparent from common sense and common speech; to wit, that we are regarded or our actions judged from the will or intentions. The two words are thus taken as synonyms [Identification!]

The last step brings us to the highest order, that of theological character:

Within all providence there is divine disposition and the succession of things.

Swedenborg selects and identifies "disposition" as the most valuable and expressive term in this order. He elaborates as follows:

That within Divine providence there is Divine disposition and the succession of things is indeed evident without confirmation. But in order that this providence may exist it is necessary that there be a nature, a world, a human society, and thus space and time, and many other things pertaining to nature and the world.

Harmonization (the last step of the method in most cases) brings us to the following scheme: *Direction—intention—divine disposition.* These three follow each other in respect to our criterion; namely, universality and eminence, and they also exhibit distinctiveness. No substitution is needed in the present case (see, however, Ex. xx, n. 64).

With this I hope to have shown the precise and efficient way of Swedenborg's procedure.

Enlightenment as a very necessary requirement for the ascertaining of the true spiritual sense of the Word, is defined thus:

They are enlightened who are in the good of life and thereby in the affection of truth. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 8694.)

This seems to be a necessary condition. Elsewhere enlightment is stated like this:

They are enlightened whose internal is open, thus who as to their internal man are capable of elevation into the light of heaven (nn. 10401, 10402, 10691, 10694.)

Enlightenment is an actual opening of the interiors of the mind, as also an elevation into the light of heaven. (N. 10330.)

Thus enlightment consists of two synchronous states: "an opened interior", and an "elevation into the light of heaven", the latter conditioned by the first.

These states actually were experienced by Swedenborg, as he testifies in numerous places,—as in "Earths in the Universe":

Since from the Divine mercy of the Lord the interiors which are of my spirit have been opened to me, and thereby it has been granted me to speak with angels and spirits . . .

The angels with whom Swedenborg could converse have a characteristic not possessed by men, which it is important to have in mind:

The Word is understood differently by the angels in the heavens and by men on earth; the former perceiving the internal or spiritual sense, whilst the latter see only the external or natural sense. (Nn. 1887, 2396.)

The angels perceive the Word in its internal sense and not in its external sense, proved from the experience of those who have conversed with me from heaven, when I was reading the Word. (Nn. 1769-1772.)

Swedenborg was thus in the fortunate and unique position to back his earthly method with a supernatural experience that cannot be repeated to the same degree by the student or disciple. There is, I believe strongly, in no one of us, this endowment. We are not able to check up our findings of the spiritual sense with living experience in the world of the spiritual sense, i.e., heaven.

There is, however, some hope even for an earthbound mind; but the condition is too severe to be fulfilled by any number of them. It is regeneration:

How the case is with enlightenment and information from the Word. Every one is enlightened and informed from the Word according to the degree of affection and truth and the longing for it, and according to the *capacity* of receiving. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9382.)

The regenerate man is actually in the internal sense of the Word, although he does not know it since his internal which is spiritual perception is open. (Ibid., n. 10401.)

But with him the spiritual of the Word flows into the natural ideas, and thus is represented naturally, because while he lives in the world this spiritual thinks in the natural man so far as it comes to perception. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5614.)

The ideas of the internal man are spiritual; but man during his life in the world does not attend thereto inasmuch as they are within his natural thought, and give it its rational faculty. (Ibid., n. 10236.)

The conclusion, therefore, is, that the special endowment of Swedenborg meant exceedingly much for the arriving at the spiritual sense. We notice also that before he was admitted to the consciousness of the other world (internal man), his exposition of Scripture shows a deplorable lack of consistency, and is of a vagueness that is only surpassed by allegorical interpretation. Not until his experiences in the other world began to count in his work, did definiteness and compactness begin to appear. The invaluable assistance which Swedenborg received from the angel companions and from the Lord Himself for the exact establishment of the internal sense, has lifted the exposition of Scripture from mere pounding on the gate of the mystical sense to a sound and reliable elaboration during twenty-nine years of observation and experience beyond material bounds.

The spiritual sense was arrived at by a scientifically correct and rigidly controlled procedure, but it was tested and checked by a living experience and a unique possibility to contrast the mechanical product with the living reality.

Its results are laid down in the "Arcana" and the "Apocalypse Explained" and Apocalypse Revealed".

Swedenborg gave us the method and the result. He could not give us access to the singular laboratory where he worked and lived, and where the findings of the *rational* were adjusted to and harmonized with the actualities of the *spiritual.*

The data he gave us from the celestial laboratory have to suffice us when we test our mechanical findings in the attempt to vertify them. For this reason the "Arcana" and the two

works on the Apocalypse will forever be the unique journals where anyone laboring to ascertain the internal sense of Scripture will find unsurpassed material, exact and compact to a degree that never can be attained by anyone not possessing the range and depth of Swedenborg's experiences.

This unequalled gift to human thought stands as the monument which the seer has erected not for his own glory but for the glory of the LORD JESUS CHRIST, of whom he was the servant.

OTHMAR TOBISCH.

# CURRENT LITERATURE

## "THE WORLD WITHIN THE BIBLE"*

In exemplary humility under such a task, Mr. Wunsch says in his preface:

> In a first book like this on Swedenborg's "Arcana Cœlestia" one cannot hope to have achieved anything like the penetration which its depth allows. The writer will be much gratified if only this Handbook proves helpful.

He also invites readers to call his attention to any errors discovered in the many references made to Swedenborg's numbers, "or to other matters that stand in need of revision or correction."

The present reviewer has not had time to verify all references, but he has as yet no errors on that score to report. He wishes to testify, too, that for a first work in its field—vast and deep as that field is—he views it as a fine achievement. The treatment is not exhaustive; that could hardly be in a work that should still remain a *hand*-book. Yet the treatment is, generally speaking, surprisingly adequate for the purpose in view.

We feel that it is a work destined to be of more value to students, especially to ministers and teachers, than to the general reader. But there are chapters which should be of special value as introduction to any reading of the "Arcana"—or, for that matter, as preparation for reading any of the Writings. Such are chapters IV, V, VI and XI. There are other portions which could be so used to advantage; but these it seems to us

**The World within the Bible;* A Handbook to Swedenborg's "Arcana Cœlestia." By WILLIAM F. WUNSCH. New York: The New-Church Press. 1929. 120 pp., 8vo. Price $1.50.

are exceptionally well suited to send one to the Unfolding of the Spiritual Sense with a right expectancy, a view of the seriousness of the claims for that sense, and a forestalling of the possible impression that these unfoldings were the mere fancies of Swedenborg.

For the student, especially to one who studies with the view of teaching, the charts of chapter XIII will prove of much help.

> Chart one indicates on what levels, in what parts of the Arcana, one finds Swedenborg pursuing his interpretation of the deeper sense . . . when and where he mounts to his highest sense, or pursues the general internal sense, or drops to the lowest, the internal historical sense. . . . Chart III . . . brings under survey the story of the Lord's glorification of His Humanity, the subject of the interpretation of Genesis xii-1. [Chart IV is in similar division and summary of Exodus.]

Besides the charts there is a Table of Key Passages, which, as every reader knows, are prizes of illumination for the matter under study, but which do not occur with regularity, or as chapter headings, but which may come at any place in a chapter or group of chapters. It is of great value to have these key passages at the beginning of a theme or series in the internal sense; and it doubtless has become the habit of all students to mark these Keys in the margin as soon as they have come upon them, so that they may readily turn to them again, for orientation or for focus or brighter light to guide in the taxing steps of the theme's particulars, as the text is unfolded verse by verse and word by word. To have them thus gathered together is a real service. These may deal with chapter groups, chapters, or groups of verses.

In addition, there is a chapter on Terms, which is helpful for new readers.

We have, also, an Appendix on "The Spiritual Sense and Swedenborg's Other World Experience," and another on "Swedenborg's Sense of the Letter Comment."

The point is made throughout the work, and stressed to full capacity, that Swedenborg's mission was to give the spiritual sense, and to deal with the "sense of the letter" only for the sake of the spiritual sense; and that his contributions to the

field proper to the studies in text and historicity and chronology, etc., with which Bible scholarship of today deals, were made "only by the way." He works on this prominently in chapter III, and in Appendix II. Needless to say, it is a field which, in its general view, all disciples of the doctrines will see alike in; but which in particulars there will be tendencies to variation, perhaps to disagreement, and certainly at least to differences of emphasis. But let it be said and agreed by all, that it is a field of vital importance, and one that we need today to deal with candidly, thoroughly, and that any honest contribution to it is an important service. That contribution we have in this work. The endeavor of the author is to steer away from the mistake of claiming for Swedenborg's work territories that he did not himself lay claim to; the task is therefore to mark out carefully the boundaries of Swedenborg's field, according to his own claims. This has not been a workless undertaking. From the nature of the matter as he has left it in Appendix II, which is in the form of a statement of some problems rather than in the solution of them, and from the modesty of his preface, we conclude that the author does not lay claim to finality in the matters discussed, but rather offers this handbook as a serious beginning in a line of study that he does claim has high importance for the Church and for those the Church today would reach and see converted to its Truth. He is very careful not to offend the disciples of modern Biblical criticism needlessly, maintaining that their field is the sense of the letter, while Swedenborg's was the sense of the spirit; and he admits and deals with the seeming exceptions to the rule, which he faces as real problems—as they are—to challenge extended study. To avoid needless offense is a real obligation, of course, so far as truth still is held aloft. Just how many of these conclusions arrived at by these scholars of the letter can be accepted without invalidating or weakening the revelation of the spiritual sense, is matter for more study than yet has been given to it in the Church. Welcome a beginning.

One of the fine portions of this handbook is its differentiation between the allegorizing of the early Church Fathers, and

the spiritual sense as revealed through Swedenborg. Many honest Bible students have been led to turn from the first glance at the Spiritual Interpretation of Swedenborg with the conclusion that this was but one more allegorizing of the Scriptures, one more example of fancy's reading *into* the Scriptures what was not in them, but in the interpreter. Much harm, too, as the author well points out, has been done by New-Church apologists through their failure to clearly draw the line between discredited allegory, and the wholly new thing in the world that the spiritual sense is.

Another fine piece of work is the treatment of the distinctions between the books of The Word, and other Bible books. The treatment of these two matters could well be used as a tract or tracts for a wider circulation than the book itself could have. The idea that many have who know only slightly of the New-Church canon of the Word, that the other books of the Bible are relegated to a lower place than that in which they are held by other Christians,—this idea is well forestalled in the author's clear handling. He with equal vigor removes the ground that has been supposed to support the contention of the misinformed, that the spiritual sense is an arbitrary dictum of Swedenborg.

> As it cannot be said, in view of his whole approach to the question, that Swedenborg's selection of the books with an internal sense was arbitrary, neither can it be said that he detracts from the standing and value of the rest of the books of the Bible. That is also a first and natural impression, and perhaps a frequent deduction, from his list.
>
> In the books which he names, Swedenborg finds a peculiar relation to the mind of God, by which they are freighted with a deeper content of His mind than their plain messages constitute.

And so on, to good purpose.

> There are connections, every one must admit, between the realm of things spiritual and the world of natural phenomena and utterance. In a general way we also recognize that these connections are also correspondences. We call intelligence as well as the sun's radiance, light, and ardor of mind and spirit, as well as the sun's energy, heat. Swedenborg noted not only such broad correspondences but minute ones, too, until he had a wide vocabulary of them. He found that the books of

the Bible having a deeper content were written in this vocabulary. His mode of interpretation rests, accordingly, in observable fact. It is grounded in a persisting feature of our natural-spiritual existence, the creative linkage of spiritual reality with the natural object of personage or word that "represents" it, or symbolizes it. The effort after a deeper sense—and doubtless the allegorist made it—unequipped with duly grounded method, and with fancy alone to direct it, is not the same thing at all as Swedenborg's exposition.

These points are well demonstrated in the course of the author's treatment.

As far as the conviction goes that there is some manner of deeper meaning, the allegorist could be cited for Swedenborg, in carefully limited substantiation of him. But, . . ."

There are a few things we now mean to point out to indicate what we meant above by speaking of the work of this handbook as "a beginning" in the study of a problem which "is matter for more study than yet has been given to it in the Church." The first we speak of appears in the book more by inference than by avowed analysis, namely: What is to be understood by the claim of Swedenborg, that *the Lord revealed* to him the spiritual sense of the Word? The author, in habitually speaking of the deeper senses given by Swedenborg as "his interpretations" and "his deeper meanings," raises thereby the question over and over: Was it *his, or* was it *the Lord's?* Doubtless the author did not intend this interrogation to come to mind; and we assume that he chose such terms in accommodation to the probable first attitude of one coming to the Writings for the first time. But his treatment of "Methods" and "Canons" of interpretation, in places brings up again the same interrogation, as we read:

Despite his erudition and the massive employment of method, the Seer himself was *convinced* that *his* [italics ours] deeper meaning was discovered to him by the Lord in records and messages of past revelation. . . .

He *conceived of the disclosure* of the spiritual meaning to him *as* revelation, of course. But to possess himself of the truth disclosed, and to put it into words, he had to employ a mass of method, as we shall appreciate better in some later chapters.

To "put it into words," that is, to express it so as to convince others of its truth, he did "employ a mass of method"—as the author of the handbook well shows in the nine distinct kinds of appeal he selects from the Seer's usage in confirming the statements of the inner sense which he sets down. But none of the cases cited in the handbook,—neither any that we can recall in our reading of the doctrines,—can be used as evidence that "to *possess himself* of the truth [italics ours] disclosed . . . he had to employ a mass of method." Certainly the considerations he sets down in affirmation of the spiritual sense of a passage, are clearly given for the rational consideration and confirmation of the reader. He nowhere represents himself as a miner, digging out the meanings; or as a sculptor carving them and moulding them by his own might and skill; or as a chemist or a mathematician coming to results by specific formulas. Instead his whole report of the spiritual sense and its coming to him—so far as texts in the handbook testify (and as far as we have read in the Writings) *appears to us* to indicate the very different thing, of an inner light shining out upon the text to say explicitly and directly what the spiritual sense is, so that he "was taught by the Lord alone while he read the Word." This is in striking evidence in those passages one comes upon frequently, where he gives the spiritual sense as something so different from the sense of anything in the letter's sense that the reader can see no connection between the two; whereupon he refers to that strange fact and says, "nevertheless the spiritual sense is" what he has stated.

The following statement looks much as if the author of the handbook had somehow drifted into thinking of these rational considerations for the confirmation of the reader—the nine "methods" he has set down—as being the machinery by which Swedenborg himself extracted the spiritual sense out of the sense of the letter. They are, truly, considerations which help the reader, not only to see the truth, but to remember it, be confirmed in it, and to come again to it when its details have become covered over in the memory by application of these considerations (of correspondence, representatives, etc.). But

how can this be turned back on Swedenborg himself thus, as if the spiritual sense he gave were not revelation, but the product of skilled craftmanship.

> The canons named and illustrated are not all the rules, but the chief of them, by which Swedenborg guides himself in arrival at the deeper sense at any point, and in the formulation of it.

The quotation from the Writings just preceding this statement, seems to us to show exactly the opposite to what it seems to show to the author of the handbook. It opens thus:

> Those in the internal sense [by which expression he meant in his day, certainly, the angels and himself, for then assuredly no others were in it] can know instantly, and indeed from a single word, what subject is treated of. Especially can they know this from the connection of several words.

Certainly we know no disciple of the internal sense who yet has made bold to claim this ability to himself, that he "can know instantly . . . what subject is treated of"—unless he remembers thus vividly what his previous reading was of what was revealed through Swedenborg concerning that subject. We do not get it that way, instantly. Since the inner sense is that which shines in the light of heaven, only those see it instantly as they read the Word, who are elevated into the light of heaven—thus, to whom it comes by revelation. *So it seems to us.* What we have said has been said more to emphasize the need of our giving more earnest and analytical study to the problems which have to do with both our own grasp of the inwardness of the Writings and our problem of rightly relating them to the states of the world, than it is to criticise the hard work that the handbook bears testimony to—in a line that we should all be working on.

Another matter we find raising questions, rather than solving them, is to the point in the quotation here given, namely:

> When Abraham's name is changed from its first form to its second, *by combining a different second word with the first*, Swedenborg speaks of the introduction of an "h" only, and from the Divine name, where it is the sole Divine letter. . . . There is a similar *resort* to this theory of the letter "h" at n. 459 (3e) in another connection.

Italics are ours, to call attention to the word "resort," suggesting expediency or retreat; and to note the apparent acceptance of the above theory put forward by some scholars regarding the change in Abram's name, and to take the occasion to point out that there is no admitted certainty of the truth of that theory; and to ask why that should be treated as a fact, and Swedenborg's explanation as a "resort." The "New Standard Bible Dictionary," by Funk & Wagnalls Co., says of the name Abraham: "The meaning *and derivation* of the word are uncertain" [italics mine]. Dr. James Strong, in his Hebrew Dictionary, gives the derivation of "Abram" as from *Abiyram,* which is itself derived from two words, "Ab," meaning *father,* and "ruwm," meaning, *to be high.* Then the name "Abraham" he says is derived from "Ab . . . and an *unused* root (probably meaning to be populous)." We ask, if, then, the root of this "second different word" is "unused," and its meaning equally nebulous, what is there about it that should be given more respectful credence than Swedenborg's "resort" to the letter "h," which when put into "Abram" does give exactly the new name "Abraham"? The point we make is, that if we feel we must apologize for Swedenborg at points, we should at least be sure that the substitutes we taken in place are not equally in need of apology. We move in natural light. Is it not becoming that we should be very slow to conclude with any one or group against him who under special Providence moved in spiritual light in all his reading of The Word?

Now that we have suggested these few critical considerations, we wish to conclude by quoting these fine words from the handbook:

> To one who feels that beyond the historical meanings of Scripture there must be further meanings in the Self-utterance of the Divine mind to men, the "Arcana" will speak like nothing else in the world of Biblical exposition. Beyond the biographies of the patriarchs, beyond the small detail of ancient history, in the spent ritual and legislation of the Old Testament, even in the endlessly significant messages of prophets and Master, the "Arcana" discloses a further content of truth vital to the spiritual life always. It finds the Bible running unfathomably deep

with the river of God. It does not let these waters remain a theory; it pours out a mighty volume of them in its pages. . . .

The "Arcana" brings to man nothing short of a religious experience. . . . The "Arcana" evangelizes the disciple again. Such has been the work's repeated appeal.

To him [Swedenborg] the Word is the body of active truth, issuing from God's mind, present inwardly in life, and fashioning men and society after the Divine mind. Necessarily it has always existed. Over the centuries of the Palestinian history of the Jews, however, this body of truth got a written expression of a unique kind. Itself not verbal, but spirit, and truth, it was displayed in event and uttered by spokesman, and done in record and document. It was perfectly wrought out in one earthly Life, the Master's, and documented, so to say, in the Gospels.

Between God's mind and this "ultimate" rendering of the Word in Scripture, there must be an infinity of truth, in which will lie another grasp of the Word, such for instance, as those who know it in the world of the spirit.

EVERETT K. BRAY.

---

## MARRIAGE*

This compilation on "Marriage" was provided for some years ago by the Council of Ministers of the General Convention, by the appointment of a Committee consisting of the Rev. Messrs. William L. Worcester, Thomas A. King, and William F. Wunsch. The actual work, or the greater part of it, has been done by Professor Wunsch, who occupies the Chair of Theology in the New-Church Theological School at Cambridge.

In 1924 Professor Wunsch made a shorter compilation on the same subject, which may be regarded as a preparation for this larger book. It was a valuable outline; and it still serves an excellent use for ministers or parents to hand to young people about to be married. This new compilation is an elaboration of the subject, and will meet the need of scholars

---

**Marriage, Ideals and Realization;* compiled from the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, by William F. Wunsch. New York: The New-Church Press. 1929. 155 pp., 16mo. Cloth, $1.

who have not time to go through the original work by Swedenborg, or are looking for an introduction to it. The selections seem to be judiciously chosen, and the arrangement of them is very attractive. The title, "Marriage—Ideals and Realization," is timely and striking, and describes the method of the book. After a brief introduction which speaks of the rarity of conjugial love in human experience now, but of its possibility under the Divine intention, and of its preciousness and eternity, the selections are gathered into two parts: I. The Heavenly Ideal; and II. The Realization of It.

Part I. After declaring that there are marriages in heaven, —because sex is a fact of the spirit, and conjugial love remains active after death,—the Lord's answer to the Sadducees is explained as teaching two things: the resurrection after the death of the earthly body; and that spiritual marriage, or the marriage of the soul to the Lord, has place in this world, if at all. The nature of the marriages that exist in heaven is shown to be a union of minds, which make the husband and wife in heaven one angel, so perfectly are their interior minds joined together—each willing what the other wills, and each thinking what the other thinks. What becomes of earthly marriages is explained. Part I is completed with illustrations of marriages in heaven, from Swedenborg's observations there.

Part II describes the realization made possible by the origin of conjugial love in the Lord, the Creator. The marriage of good and truth in all things of the universe proceeds from Him, because in Him they are united, or conjoined. In man and woman this inclination of good and truth to be conjoined becomes conjugial love.

Conjugial love has a correspondence with the marriage of the Lord and the Church. In the Word the Lord is called the Bridegroom and Husband, and the Church the Bride and Wife. From this marriage of the Lord and the Church are born all spiritual offspring, and as the Church increases in human souls conjugial love increases; but without the Lord and the Church, it cannot be born, or exist. Monogamy is shown to be the Divinely intended form of marriage, so that chastity can be

predicated only of the marriage of one husband and one wife; and chastity is in the practice of such marriage, and not in polygamy or celibacy. Moral wisdom is a necessary companion of conjugial love; shunning evil and doing good is the wisdom of life which promotes true marriage. Extracts follow on the Means to Union, Respective Duties of the Husband and the Wife, Deep Changes Marriage Makes (by which the husband becomes more and more a husband, and the wife more and more a wife), The Sense of Oneness, Courtship and Choice, The Wedding, etc. Certainly it is an excellent compilation; and the world's need of what it contains is manifest.

The book has a good Table of Contents and an excellent Index.

Male and female have been created to be the very form of the marriage of good and truth, the male to be the understanding of truth, thus truth in form; and the female to be the will of good, thus good in form; and there has been implanted in each, from their inmosts, an inclination towards conjunction into one.

H. Clinton Hay.

## ANOTHER NATURALISTIC TREATISE ON THE BIBLE*

Christianity is facing the most serious crisis of its history. The reality of God and of the spiritual world, the character of the Bible, and the basic facts of the Christian faith, are brought in question more deliberately and confidently, and with a more fully equipped skepticism, than ever before.

The application of the principles of naturalistic philosophy to the study of human life, and so to all religion, and especially to the study of the Bible, has with very many shaken the foundations of Christian belief, and challenged the presuppositions of Christian thought. It belongs to the integrity of this

**Unravelling the Book of Books:* Being the Story of how the Puzzles of the Bible were solved and its Documents unravelled. By Ernest R. Trattner. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1929. 325 pp., 8vo. $2.75.

philosophy to exclude the supernatural, and to relegate all ideas of the supernatural to the category of myth and superstition. It is the fundamental assumption of naturalism that nature is all there is; and we are supposed to observe nature in the world around us and within us, and in history. This is all there is to be observed; all else is fancy and fiction, the work of the imagination. Religion, according to this philosophy, is simply a development of human nature, man's re-action to the influences of his environment; and it involves nothing more than this natural environment and his own native capacities.

In excluding the supernatural, no ground is left for the idea of God or of the spiritual world. These ideas are then explained as the outgrowth of superstition, and set aside as the creations of an untrained imagination. We cannot say, therefore, that God created man, but rather that man created the idea of God in his own image and likeness. In this view, all idea of revelation is absurd, and is to be utterly rejected; and with it goes the Bible.

The Bible has been a problem to historians from the days of the early Church Fathers; and it is now more of a problem than ever. When we think of the immense amount of scholarship that has been given to it since Spinoza published his epoch making *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus,* we begin to realize the interest and industry this problem has aroused. Spinoza defined and applied to the study of the Bible the principles of the natural history method. His results were in general identical with those of the naturalistic Bible students of today. If we start out with the assumption that the natural history of the Bible is all we can know about it, the result is predetermined. For then the Bible appears to be only the natural history of the Jewish race, and on the same level with other race histories, —the history of the Greeks, the Romans, the English, and the rest. It may or may not be that God is recognized in this history. If he is, it is from the natural history point of view quite a superfluous and irrelevant consideration. Many Bible students, especially the more cautious ones, even though they adopt and use the natural history method, profess and try to

hold on to the belief in God. But this belief does not grow out of their method, nor is it consistent with the presuppositions of their method. They have the belief to start with, and they are inclined to hold on to it because of their Christian traditions and associations. But when their traditions and associations are discredited by naturalistic and rationalistic philosophy, and by the destructive analysis of the Christian documents, they are left helpless and surrender themselves wholly to the plausible results of the natural history method, pursued without religious intent or background.

Mr. Trattner's book entitled "Unravelling the Book of Books,"* which is before us, is a very good specimen of this mode of treating the Bible. The author has facility, literary feeling, and imagination. His book is well written and interesting. He has the spirit, the zeal, and apparently the industry of the Bible critics; and he gives a good summary of their work and results. He seems to have no religious interests, and is frankly, deliberately, and consistently naturalistic. He is intolerant of supernaturalism, and loftily dismisses it as superstition.

The Bible has, of course, a natural history, and it is important to know what we can about this history. There are difficulties about the Bible; chronological, logical and linguistic difficulties, which we should do our best to clear up. The natural history method is quite legitimate within its proper limits and for its own purposes. But the Bible has a spiritual as well as a natural history; and it is more important to know its spiritual history than it is its natural history. When, therefore, it is assumed that its natural history is a complete account of it, we do violence to its true character.

The author follows the usual line of critical treatment. He reports in a vivid and confident style that, on the basis of certain linguistic and chronological characteristics, industrious and painstaking scholars have discovered that the Bible is made up of four different bodies of material, which they call respectively the "Yahwistic," the "Elohistic," the "Deuteronomic," and the "Priestly" documents. They do not claim that these

documents are known as such; but they suppose them to have existed, in order to explain certain features of the Bible text. Then they go on to imagine how these several documents were combined to constitute our present Old Testament. They go so far as to divide up the existing books, and apportion the divisions to the several documents. For example, they divide up the Book of Genesis into three older documents, the "Yahwistic," the "Elohistic," and the "Priestly." By plausible "conjectures," by inferences, and by generalizations based upon isolated statements, they give an air of historicity to their fictions. The conjectures and inferences of one man are repeated by his followers as established historical fact. In this way the creations of the historical imagination are made into actual history. The historical situation involved here is too complicated for treatment on this occasion.

There is pressing need for thoroughgoing criticism of the whole field of modern Biblical scholarship from an independent and more spiritual point of view. We may quite rightly appreciate the labors of Biblical scholars, and accept their assured results; but we cannot yield to their narrow naturalistic presuppositions and requirements. For example, on the authority of Swedenborg and on the authority of the Bible text we may hold that there are two stories of creation in the early chapters of Genesis; and on the authority of Swedenborg we may also accept that these stories take us back to earlier documents, and following the suggestion of the text we may call them the Jehovistic and the Elohistic documents. But to extend these documents to cover the "Northern" and "Southern" Bible respectively, is an entirely different matter, and leads to a labyrinth of historical complications.

At this point it may be well to pause and give an outline of our author's treatment. The book consists of five parts. Part I gives a very readable sketch of the history of modern Biblical investigations from Spinoza through Richard Simon, Jean Astruc, J. G. Eichhorn, Hermann Hupfeld, to Alexander Geddes, and Wilhelm De Wette. During this period the Book of Genesis was dissected into the three documents above men-

tioned, and the Book of Deuteronomy was isolated and set apart as a separate document. Part II undertakes to recount the story of "how the four most important documents of the Old Testament were independently written, and then combined into the one volume called the Pentateuch (the five books of Moses.)" The first chapter deals with the formation of the "Yahwistic document," or "the Bible of the South Kingdom." This Bible is supposed to have been written by Jews of Jerusalem, a group of writers of the time of David and Solomon. They collected their materials from the traditions then current. The distinctive characteristic of this body of writings is that the word "Yahweh" is used instead of "Elohim." The second chapter deals in a similar way with the "Elohistic document" or the "Bible of the North." This is supposed to have been written a hundred or more years after the preceding document, by "the men of Ephraim" of the "Kingdom of the North." Nothing is known of the writers of either of these books, but their existence is inferred from the demands of the theory. The third chapter tells of how the Book of Deuteronomy came into existence; and its origin is connected with the Law which King Josiah read before the people of the Temple. It is supposed to have been written in the previous reign of Manasseh. The fourth chapter essays to relate how the Hebrew priests wrote a new version of their people's "Law and History," thereby creating the "Priestly Book of Ritual." These priests are supposed to have done their work at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, about 444 B.C. Ezra is said to have read the book to the people. Chapter five purports to tell how these four documents were woven together to form the Pentateuch. This story does away with Moses and his authorship altogether. It may allow for traditions which go back to Moses; Moses himself, it would seem, wrote nothing. Part III deals with the Prophets and the final completion of the Old Testament. There is some interesting matter here, but we cannot stop to characterize it. It is very largely the work of the historical imagination. Parts IV and V deal with the New Testament. Here the work of the critics

has dissociated the Gospels from the Lord, and left them as compilations from various traditions. In order to explain some of the features of the Gospels, the critics have imagined an older document which they call "Q," which they suppose to have existed before the Gospels took shape, and which was in part the source of Matthew and Luke. The Gospel of John and the Book of Revelation have not yet been dissected, but their authorship has been brought into doubt.

The book as a whole makes a very disturbing impression upon one who reverences the Bible as the Word of God. It leaves one with the demand for more history and less fiction.

In his introduction to Martin Van Buren Denslow's "Modern Thinkers," Robert Ingersoll wrote that, although Swedenborg was wrong, his doctrine of correspondences was the only thing that could save the Bible. This estimate of Swedenborg's doctrine of correspondence does credit to Ingersoll's insight and intelligence. The doctrine of correspondence alone enables us to understand how the Bible could have been given to men, and at the same time made the vehicle of spiritual and divine truth; how it could have a meaning on a higher plane than that of the Bible writers. It gives an explanation of inspiration and of revelation which does not call for an extraordinary degree of spiritual enlightenment in the Bible writers. This principle corrects the naturalistic assumption that the meaning for the writer is all the meaning there is in the Bible.

It may be that the power of the Bible to bring spiritual help to men will save it, and it may be that the Lord could save it by the experience men have of its spiritual help. But we think that the Lord made His Second Coming in the spiritual sense of His Word to meet this very exigency, and that He will save the Bible through this means.

LEWIS F. HITE.

## RECENT SCIENTIFIC THEORY AND RELIGION

When the history of modern Christian thought comes to be written at a day when it will be possible to see it in a proper perspective, there is little doubt but that it will appear that that history has been largely dominated by the development of science. Not only has religious thought adopted to a large extent such scientific ideas as evolution, but it has been influenced by scientific methods of procedure and the philosophy which has been implicit in physical science from Newton to the present day, in spite of its materialistic and deterministic tendencies. Within the last decade, however, the development of the theory of relativity and of the quantum hypothesis has forced into the open scientific determinism and materialism, and is on the way to demolishing them.

It is as an expression of this new point of view among scientists that Prof. Arthur Stanley Eddington's "The Nature of the Physical World"* is significant. Eddington is Plumian Professor of Astronomy in the University of Cambridge, England, a past president of the Royal Astronomical Society, a leading student of astrophysics, and the foremost exponent of the theory of relativity in the English language. So formidable is Eddington's position in the realm of science that one might expect a formidable treatise from his pen. He is capable of such; but the Gifford Lectures of which this book has been made are of a different quality. They are scarcely "popular" in the sense of our popular scientific magazines. As he says himself: "Whilst much of the book should prove fairly easy reading, arguments of considerable difficulty have to be taken in their turn." Yet even in the difficult sections skilful exposition often obscures the difficulty.

Simply as an exposition of the most recent developments of physical science, the book should be very useful. Its real value lies, however, in its bearing on the philosophy of science, and

**The Nature of the Physical World.* By Prof. Arthur Stanley Eddington. (Gifford Lectures of 1927.) New York: Macmillan Co. 1928. 378 pp., 8vo. $3.75.

the relation of that to religion. Doubtless much will be rendered obsolete in the next few years.

Eddington's own philosophy, which he expounds, is probably not very important. But though his name may never get into the histories of philosophy, the significant fact is that he can deny determinism and construct an idealistic philosophy, not in spite of science, but so to speak with its permission. On these points he speaks as follows:

> It has become doubtful whether it will ever be possible to construct a physical world solely out of the knowable [by which term he means what can be perceived by the senses, either directly or by means of instruments], the guiding principle in our macroscopic theories. If it is possible, it involves a great upheaval of the present foundations. It seems more likely that we must be content to admit a mixture of the knowable and unknowable. This means a denial of determinism, because the data required for a prediction of the future will include the unknowable elements of the past. I think it was Heisenberg who said, "The question whether from a complete knowledge of the past we can predict the future does not arise, because a complete knowledge of the past involves a self-contradiction."
>
> It is only through a quantum action that the outside world can interact with ourselves, and knowledge of it can reach our minds. A quantum action may be the means of revealing to us some fact about Nature, but simultaneously a fresh unknown is implanted in the womb of Time. An addition to knowledge is won at the expense of an addition to ignorance. It is hard to empty the well of Truth with a leaky bucket. (Pp. 228, 229.)
>
> It is a consequence of the advent of the quantum theory that *physics is no longer pledged to a scheme of deterministic law.* (P. 294; italics his.)

If Eddington is right, there opens an opportunity for a new reconcilation of religion and science. Neither will swallow the other, nor will the two be kept in completely separate compartments. As a symbol of the physical world with many practical uses, science will continue. As to the real nature of the world which it symbolizes, it can of itself have nothing to say. The problem of comprehending in one philosophy the world of nature and the world of spirit, stands waiting a solution. We believe that the philosophy of Swedenborg contains the solution.

FREDERIC R. CROWNFIELD.

## SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

The regular price for the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is $2.00
and for the NEW-CHURCH LEAGUE JOURNAL is $1.00

### WE OFFER
### A JOINT SUBSCRIPTION TO BOTH FOR $2.50

provided such joint subscription adds a new name to at least one of the periodicals. Such joint subscription may be addressed either to the LEAGUE JOURNAL or to the

**NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, 134 Bowdoin St., BOSTON, MASS.**

# THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
**Massachusetts New-Church Union**
**134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.**

# THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

## FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

## SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION
**Incorporated**

**18 East 41st Street** **New York, N. Y.**

# THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, atthe age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

**UNITED STATES.**

**Akron, Ohio.** New-Church Book Room, 117 So. High St.
**Baltimore, Md.** Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.
**Boston, Mass.** Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
**Chicago, Ill.** Western New-Church Union, Room 1726, 17 N. State St.
**Cincinnati, Ohio.** New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.
**Detroit, Mich.** Church Book Shop, 92 E. Forest Ave.
**Los Angeles, Calif.** New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
**Minneapolis, Minn.** New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.
**New York, N. Y.** Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.
**Philadelphia, Pa.** New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
**San Francisco, Calif.** New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
**St. Louis, Mo.** New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.
**Washington, D. C.** New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.
**Wilmington, Del.** New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

**CANADA.**

**Toronto, Ont.** Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

**ENGLAND.**

**London.** The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
**Manchester.** New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
**Glasgow, Scotland.** Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

**AUSTRALIA.**

**Brisbane, Queensland,** 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

**INDIA.**

**Bombay, Swedenborg Society of India,** 7 Topiwala's Bldgs., Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

**SWITZERLAND.**

**Lausanne, Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise,** 1 Avenue de France.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President,*
CHARLES N. MASON,
JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer,*
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.